

**PERSPECTIVES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS RELATED TO SCHOOL
LIBRARY MEDIA PROGRAMS AFTER PARTICIPATING IN AN ONLINE
COURSE, "SCHOOL LIBRARY ADVOCACY FOR ADMINISTRATORS"**

A Dissertation

presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

DEBORAH DETENBECK LEVITOV

Dr. John M. Budd, Dissertation Supervisor

MAY 2009

©Copyright by Deborah D. Levitov, 2009

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

PERSPECTIVES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS RELATED TO SCHOOL LIBRARY MEDIA PROGRAMS AFTER PARTICIPATING IN AN ONLINE COURSE, "SCHOOL LIBRARY ADVOCACY FOR ADMINISTRATORS"

presented by Deborah D. Levitov, a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy, and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

John M. Budd

Linda Esser

Denice Adkins

Sanda Erdelez

Peggy Placier

Acknowledgements

Without the support of my family, friends, and colleagues I would not have pursued this goal, nor would I have succeeded. I want to thank my husband Peter for being a co-conspirator and supporter of the plan, for the nine months of weekend drives to Missouri, and for the many dinners cooked—it all means more than I can ever express.

I want to thank my son Alex who served as an encourager and an amazing inspiration. We started our paths to higher education the same year and now he begins his journey toward a doctorate as I end mine. I am so proud of all he has achieved. Also, my stepchildren, my blended family, Karen and Dan have served as wonderful examples as they pursued their masters and doctorate, and their incredibly successful careers. I am in awe of their accomplishments. Thanks specifically to my parents, I am so pleased that they were able to see me through this.

I would like to express my appreciation to my committee, Dr. John Budd, as chair, Dr. Denice Adkins, Dr. Sanda Erdelez, Dr. Linda Esser and Dr. Peggy Placier. Thank you also to Deb Kachel, Marj Willeke, Gary Hartzell, Danny Callison and Nancy Bush for the time, effort and feedback given out of the kindness of their hearts and dedication to education. Accolades are also due to Jane Wall and Cindy DeRyke for getting me through the many edits and Laurie Logston for the virtual support.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	ii
Abstract.....	ix
Chapter 1—Introduction	1
Purpose.....	1
Context/Background	1
Terminology.....	2
Research Questions.....	2
Importance or Context of the Study.....	3
Methodology.....	4
Participants.....	4
Assumptions.....	7
Limitations	7
Potential Implications of the Proposed Study.....	8
Chapter 2—Review of the Related Literature	10
Introduction.....	10
Exemplary School Library Media Programs	10
School Library Media Program Components	14
Administrators’ Knowledge of Library Media Programs.....	16
Informing School Administrators about School Library Media Programs	21
Challenges of the Change Process	25
Summary of the Review of Literature	28
Chapter 3—Research Design and Methodology.....	29
Introduction.....	29

Background	29
Role of the Researcher and Context.....	32
Participants.....	35
Methodology.....	38
Data Collection	43
Data Analysis	46
Standardized Data	50
Summary	52
Chapter 4—Presentation of the Data	53
Introduction.....	53
Administrators’ Level of Preparation Related to School Library Media Programs	53
Levels of Learning in an Online Environment	54
Administrator Knowledge of Online Course Content	55
Emerging Themes	64
Changed Perceptions for the Library Media Specialist and the Program.....	64
Improved Communication	79
Awareness of Administrator’s Role.....	88
Action Planning	93
Demographics	107
Online Survey Results.....	107
Summary	109
Chapter 5—Summary of Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	110
Introduction.....	110
Summary of Findings.....	111
Mixed Methods	111

Demographics	112
Knowledge of Course Content.....	113
Administrators' Changed Perceptions	119
Program Changes	126
A Shift in Language	129
The Online Survey Discussion Points.....	131
Conclusions.....	134
Limitations	137
Implications.....	138
Solutions for Informing Administrators.....	139
Informing Library Media Specialists	142
Recommendations for Further Study	143
References.....	146
Appendices.....	152
Vita.....	264

List of Tables

Table 1	Cronbach Coefficient Alpha	41
Table 2	Word Wall for Role of Administrator.....	47
Table 3	Excerpt of Interpretive Impressions.....	48
Table 4	Semantic Relationships.....	49
Table 5	Open Coding Example.....	50
Table 6	Online Course Content Rating	56
Table 7	Module 1-4 Rating Guideline	56
Table 8	Module 1 Evaluation Survey Results.....	57
Table 9	Module 2 Evaluation Survey Results.....	59
Table 10	Module 3 Evaluation Survey Results.....	60
Table 11	Module 4 Evaluation Survey Results.....	62
Table 12	Roles of the Library Media Specialist	71

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Cronbach Coefficient Alpha	152
Appendix B	Definition of Terms.....	158
Appendix C	Mansfield Course Brochure	163
Appendix D	Action Plan.....	166
Appendix E	The 13 Point Library Media Program Checklist.....	169
Appendix F	Mansfield University Permission.....	175
Appendix G	Administrator Cover Letter..... Administrator Consent Form	177
Appendix H	General Demographic Survey.....	182
Appendix I	Library Media Specialist Cover Letter	186
	Library media Specialists Consent Form	
	Email to Library Media Specialists	
Appendix J	Interview Consent Form	191
Appendix K	Modules 1-4 Evaluation Forms.....	194
Appendix L	Online Survey Instrument for Administrators	199
	Online Survey Instrument for Library Media Specialists	
Appendix M	Interview Question Guidelines	210
Appendix N	Online Survey Data.....	219
Appendix O	Participants Demographics	240
Appendix P	School Demographics	242
Appendix Q	Reasons for Incompletes	244
Appendix R	Interview Schedule 2006 and 2007.....	246
Appendix S	Open Coding.....	248
Appendix T	Interpretive Impressions.....	250
Appendix U	Changed Perceptions of Administrators	252
Appendix V	Themes from Administrators' Action Plans	254

Appendix W	Level of Preparation and Importance of Information	256
Appendix X	Learning Levels in an Online Environment.....	258
Appendix Y	Online Survey Questions Rated Highest by Administrators.....	260
Appendix Z	Online Survey Questions Rated Highest by Library Media Specialists	262

PERSPECTIVES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS RELATED TO SCHOOL
LIBRARY MEDIA PROGRAMS AFTER PARTICIPATING IN AN ONLINE
COURSE, "SCHOOL LIBRARY ADVOCACY FOR ADMINISTRATORS"

by

Deborah Detenbeck Levitov

Chair: Dr. John M. Budd

This mixed methods study examines the experiences of two groups of administrators who participated in the online course, "School Library Advocacy for Administrators," respectively, in the summer of 2005 and the fall of 2006. The course was offered through Mansfield University in Mansfield, Pennsylvania. It was developed to educate administrators about school library media programs and the role of the library media specialist, and to subsequently create administrative advocates for school libraries. The purpose of this study is to explore how these administrators perceive that the course made a difference in what they know about school library media programs and how the information impacted their perspectives and actions in relationship to the library media programs in their buildings.

Employing a mixed methods approach, this study makes use of standardized responses from surveys, action plans, feedback sheets and demographic information. In addition, it uses descriptive/phenomenological methods to examine the lived experiences of the participants through interviews. Participants' perceptions, shared through semi-structured interviews, are the result of their individual interpretations of the meanings assigned to events and to acquired knowledge. The interviews show how participants

make meaning of their experiences related to a Mansfield University online course and how they put the resulting action plans to work.

Findings indicate that the Mansfield University online course provides an impetus for participating administrators to change their perceptions toward library media programs and make changes in their school library programs to some degree. Based on these findings, the Mansfield online course appears to offer a viable solution for informing educational administrators about school library programs. It also provides an avenue for filling a gap that exists in university level educational administration coursework.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Purpose

Despite the existence of standards and readily available resources for guiding the development of school library media programs, many school administrators still do not know that these resources and standards exist, and, consequently, do not know the purpose of school library programs (O'Neal, 2004). This mixed methods study examines the experiences of two groups of administrators who participated in the online course, "School Library Advocacy for Administrators," respectively, in the summer of 2005 and the fall of 2006. The course was offered through Mansfield University in Mansfield, Pennsylvania. It was developed to educate administrators about school library media programs and the role of the library media specialist, and to subsequently create administrative advocates for school libraries (Kachel, 2003). The purpose of this study is to explore how these administrators perceive the course made a difference in what they know about school library media programs and how the information impacted their perspectives and actions in relationship to the library media programs in their buildings.

Context/Background

The online course, "School Library Advocacy for Administrators," has been offered by Mansfield University since 2003, as a way of educating school administrators about school library media programs. It is a unique means of helping educational administrators gain knowledge about school libraries through identified resources such as research studies, current literature, program planning materials and standards. The course

is 5 weeks long and requires a 15-hour time commitment from administrators with an option for professional development or graduate credit hours (see Appendix A).

Administrators, through the use of course resources, examine research and literature related to school library media programs, learn about the role of the library media specialist, define information literacy, learn the importance of the student research process, and identify the key elements of exemplary library media programs. They also learn how to apply course content to their individual schools, students, and teachers by developing program improvement plans for their library media programs.

Thirteen administrators who enrolled in the online course and their library media specialists agreed to participate in this study. Nine of the 13 administrators agreed to give telephone interviews after they had completed the course and implemented action plans developed within the context of the course, all of which is further explained in Chapter 3 (see Appendix O and Appendix P).

Terminology

Since the language used is very specific to this study, a listing of terms and the definitions is provided in Appendix B.

Research Questions

The purpose of the Mansfield online course is to inform administrators about school libraries, assist them with internalizing the information, and then, applying it to their programs. This study examines the following questions related to the experience of 13 administrators enrolled in the course. When school administrators are provided with in-depth knowledge of school library media programs established by research as well as frameworks of the profession, in what ways do they perceive that they:

1. gain information about school library programs?
2. change their perceptions of library media programs? and
3. change their actions related to their building library media programs (e.g., through scheduling, staffing, program initiatives, professional assignments, evaluation, budgeting, in-services, communications, etc.)?

The focus of the study seeks insights related to these questions through the perceptions of the administrator participants as well as through information provided by self-evaluation module surveys, course feedback forms and action plans.

Importance or Context of the Study

The three questions pertaining to administrator participants' perceptions are at the heart of this research study. The importance of examining the effects of the online course in relationship to these questions is key to whether or not such a course can offer possible solutions for informing administrators about school libraries and, in turn, to empower them to be advocates. As established in the literature review (Chapter 2), administrators are an essential element to the success of a school library media program. It is, therefore, important to identify ways to inform and educate them about the programs and the responsibilities of the library media professionals who manage these programs.

The Mansfield online course offers a unique solution to a long existing problem. There are no other solutions of this nature that emerge in the review of the literature. This study, based on the experiences shared by the participants, will help determine if such a course is a viable solution to successfully informing school administrators about school library media programs.

Methodology

Employing a mixed methods approach, this study makes use of standardized responses from surveys, action plans, feedback sheets and demographic information. In addition, it uses descriptive/phenomenological methods to examine the lived experiences of the participants (Hatch, 2002) through interviews. Participants' perceptions, shared through semi-structured interviews, are the result of their individual interpretations of the meanings assigned to events and to acquired knowledge. The interviews show how participants make meaning of their experiences related to a Mansfield University online course and how they put the resulting action plans to work (Seidman, 1998).

The interviews, surveys, self-evaluations, course feedback sheets and action plans provide multiple perspectives of the participants' experiences. Standardized responses alone are not sufficient to accommodate individual, subjective differences, thus the interviews help provide a deeper understanding of the participants' perceptions (Seidman, 1998). The chosen mixed methods research approach takes advantage of multiple sources of information that add depth to the interpretation (Greene & Caracelli, 1997, p. 10).

Participants

The literature suggests that school administrators frequently have limited background knowledge about school libraries but, at the same time, have power to influence the success of the school library media programs in their schools. Administrators' knowledge about school libraries and their understanding of the role they play and the roles of the library media specialist are critical to developing and sustaining an effective program. The Mansfield University course, "School Library Advocacy for

Administrators,” assumes that administrators’ acquired knowledge about school libraries will lead to informed decisions and actions.

Mansfield University students, enrolled in the library media certification program (e.g., interim or acting library media specialists, classroom teachers and others) asked administrators in their buildings or district to enroll in the Mansfield University course, “School Library Advocacy for Administrators.” Eligibility for the study required enrolled administrators to complete all coursework and have a fully certified library media specialist in their respective buildings or an individual in the process of completing certification requirements. The administrators who participated in the study enrolled in the Mansfield course during spring 2005 or summer 2006 (see Chapter 3).

Originally, 40 administrators registered to participate in the Mansfield online course during 2005 and 2006. Twenty of the 40 enrollees actually completed the course during this time period and 3 finished at a later date. In the end, 23 enrollees, 58% of the original 40, completed the online course and 17, 43%, did not complete the course. Completion of the course was somewhat higher (58%) in the summer of 2005 and the fall of 2006 than the completion rate (51%) for other courses offered from 2003 through 2007.

Of the original 40 administrators registered in 2005 and 2006 for the online course, 4 never logged on and gave no reason for not participating. Five logged on but did not complete the course for reasons listed as either personal or that they were too busy. Nine started the coursework but had to drop out for personal-family reasons or work responsibilities. Two started the course but dropped out without giving a reason. Twenty of those that signed up completed the 2005 and 2006 courses. Three people who

started the 2005 and 2006 sessions dropped out but went on to complete the course at a later date (see Appendix Q).

Thirteen of the 20 administrators who successfully completed the course agreed to participate in the study. In addition to the quantitative data gathered, a sampling of administrator participants were invited to participate in telephone interviews regarding their learning experiences. Nine administrators agreed to be interviewed for the study (4 from summer 2005; 5 from fall of 2006).

Administrator participants were located in 9 states representing various regions of the country (northeast region, 4 states; Midwest region, 1 state; southern region, 1 state; southwestern region, 1 state; western region, 2 states). They represented the range of K-12 grade levels (8 elementary, 1 elementary-middle, 1 middle, 1 middle-high school, 2 high school). Participants' years of experience as administrators ranged from 1 year to 9 years. Most administrators had worked with their current library media specialist for 1 to 5 years and 2 had worked with the same library media specialist for 6 to 10 years. Nine of the 13 administrators had full-time library media specialists, 3 had library media specialists that were less than half-time, and 1 had a library media specialist with a 4-day-a-week assignment. Nine of the 13 had fixed schedules, 2 had combination schedules, and 2 were flexible (see Appendix P).

In spite of busy and demanding schedules, these 13 administrators found time to sign up for and complete the Mansfield online course. Some were in the middle of changing assignments; others were in their first year as a principal. All had new initiatives (e.g., grants, new curriculum implementations, technology studies, etc.)

underway in their buildings and districts. All were trying to balance the many responsibilities and stresses associated with being a building administrator.

In addition, 9 of the 13 administrators agreed to participate in 3 interviews over the course of 3-4 weeks. During the interview schedule they dealt with flooded buildings, lost children, budget cuts and more. As one administrator pointed out, there's a lot more to the job than being an instructional leader,

I'm busy with kids . . . I've got to be in the cafeteria and I've got to make sure everyone gets on the bus and I have to answer parents questions about this teacher or that teacher. I spent a lot of days this year trying to figure out how to catch [a] chipmunk. Building issues . . . the air conditioning didn't work.

The dedication to the success of their schools was reflected in their willingness to take the Mansfield course and was further established through their interview comments.

Assumptions

The underlying assumption of this study is that school administrators have limited background knowledge about school libraries while, at the same time, they have power that influences the success of school library media programs. For this study, interviews, examination of course feedback forms, self-assessments, surveys and action plans were used to determine how the administrators perceived the background knowledge about school libraries influenced their perceptions and actions and how that knowledge served to motivate them to make changes in their programs.

Limitations

Limitations of the study included the virtual nature of the course and the study, with no face-to-face meetings. In addition, the short period of time between the administrators taking the course and putting their action plans into place (nine months for

the 2005 participants and five months for the 2006 participants) could be seen as a limitation. Participants could have been compelled to indicate more progress on their action plan out of obligation to meet the expectations linked to the professional development funds provided by Mansfield University. Also, there is potential for the participating administrators to have a preconceived pro-library media disposition by the sheer nature of signing up to take the course. They may have signed up with the intent to help a teacher or acting library media specialist in their school or district get a scholarship from Mansfield as well as gain professional development money for their schools. Both of these limitations are addressed in Chapters 4 and 5.

Potential Implications of the Proposed Study

Administrators who participated in the study and completed the online course were from nine different states and five different regions of the country. The geographical diversity and the varied educational settings (e.g., grade levels, socio-economic status, student population, community size, full time equivalent (F.T.E.) of the library media specialist, etc.) helped to eliminate assumptions that findings were influenced by demographics. The diversity represented creates reliability and trustworthiness of the findings and helps to establish the Mansfield course as a viable solution for informing these and other administrators about library media programs.

The findings of the study provide insight from the perspective of the school administrators about what they knew or didn't know about school libraries as they began the online course and after taking it. It provides access to their opinions regarding their role, the role of the library media specialist, and others in developing and sustaining successful programs. It confirms the importance of background knowledge about school

libraries and how that information helps administrators take informed action or make educated changes for school library programs. The study also provides library media specialists with insights into the perspectives of school administrators and the challenges that face them when dealing with library media programs. It helps define expectations that administrators have for library media specialists.

Chapter 2

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

This chapter will review literature related to school administrators and their knowledge of school library media programs and the role they play in supporting and promoting those programs. The themes addressed in this chapter include national standards for exemplary school library media programs, designated components of school library media programs, administrators' knowledge of school library media programs, ways to better educate administrators about school library media programs, and the role of administrators in proposing change for school library media programs.

Exemplary School Library Media Programs

Library media specialists have held positions in schools since the early 1900s, yet “to play a pivotal role in student achievement, they must be meaningfully built into the ‘architecture’ of the leadership in schools” (Zmuda & Harada, 2008, p. 26). There are extensive resources and literature available that can contribute to this goal and guide the development of excellent school library media programs integral to the educational mission.

A fundamental document for quality school libraries is the national standards for school library media programs. These standards provide guiding principles for program development and evaluation as well as strategies for assessing exemplary practices. The American Association of School Librarians (AASL) and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) jointly published *Information Power: Building*

Partnerships for Learning (1998) that serves as the national school library program guidelines. In addition to *Information Power*, a supplementary text, *A Planning Guide for Information Power: with School Library Media Program Assessment Rubric for the 21st Century* was published in 1999. Most recently, *AASL Standards for the 21st-Century Learner* (2007) and *Standards for the 21st-Century Learner IN ACTION* (2009) have been released and provide guidance for teaching, learning, and assessment in the school library media program.

Information Power (AASL & AECT, 1998) stresses the importance of building “effective working relationship with teachers and the school’s administration” (p. 123). The importance of developing “mission, goals, and objectives of the library media program” with the administrator is emphasized (p. 106). The guidelines frame the role of the administrator through the goals established for library media specialists (e.g., defining mission and goals, assessment of program and personnel, communication, development of policy and procedure, budget, support, identifying teaching and learning connections, collection development, etc.).

As stated in *A Planning Guide for Information Power: with School Library Media Program Assessment Rubric for the 21st Century*,

Teachers and administrators must become aware of the importance of information literacy as the means to students’ success in the future; to understand the value and necessity of teaching students the critical and creative thinking skills that enable them to use information; and to acknowledge that the information curriculum is an integral part of the basic instructional program from earliest elementary grades through senior high. (AASL, 1999, p. 3)

It is recommended that a planning committee be formed to include a cross section of teachers, administrators and community representatives (AASL, 1999, p. 5). This

document emphasizes the importance of involving others, especially the administrator and teachers, in identifying goals (immediate and long-range) and developing strategies for implementation.

The *AASL Standards for the 21st-Century Learner* (AASL, 2007), and *Standards for the 21st-Century Learner IN ACTION* (AASL, 2009) has the following message for administrators:

The focus of these standards is on the learner, but implicit within every standard and indicator is the necessity of a strong school library media program (SLMP) that offers a highly-qualified school library media specialist (a term used interchangeably with librarian), equitable access to up-to-date resources, dynamic instruction, and a culture that nurtures reading and learning throughout the school. (p. 5)

This document also emphasizes the responsibility of all educators to realize the importance of “providing environments that support and foster successful learning” (AASL, 2009, p. 6). Necessary for students is equitable access to resources, opportunities to learn, a collaborative learning environment, and access to a quality library (p. 6).

The AASL guidelines, published in *Information Power*, provide a framework for exemplary library media programs and professional practice. The guidelines characterize exemplary programs as an environment for learning. It is an environment where students and teachers can pursue learning goals and curriculum objectives as well as personal interests through resources that build and expand knowledge. In a study conducted by Ross Todd and Carol Kuhlthau, 99.4% of students, grades 3-12 “believe school libraries and their services help them become better learners” (Whelan, 2004, p. 46). Studies have shown a significant impact of school libraries on student learning (Lance & Loertscher, 2001; Todd & Kuhlthau, 2005a, 2005b; Todd, Kuhlthau, & Heinstrom, 2005) show

additional impact of the school library on student learning through assessment measures for inquiry learning.

The role of the library media specialist is included in the recommendations for exemplary library media programs. According to *Information Power* (AASL & AECT, 1998) the roles for the library media specialist are those of teacher, instructional partner, information specialist and administrator (pp. 4-5). A study done by McCracken (2001) reflects that for library media specialists to successfully expand their roles, they must have “supportive administrators and teachers; use of new technology, including the Internet; professional development opportunities; their own abilities and attitudes; adequate funding; and clerical support” (¶6).

According to Snyder (2000),

The survival of school libraries depends on the commitment of its stakeholders, and the extent of that commitment rests with its professionals: they hold the key to their destiny; they have the power to shape decisions. They can—and must—sell their programs to critical decision makers. (p. xvii)

Alexander and Carey (2003) support this statement in their summary of survey findings, “the building level professional is the only one with the opportunity for day-to-day influence on the perceptions of the principal” (p. 13). Yet, according to Shannon (1996) library media specialists are not well prepared to be advocates for their programs.

Shannon’s (2002) review of literature regarding interpersonal and communication skills of the library media specialist shows

overwhelming evidence of the importance for school library media specialists to possess effective communication and interpersonal skills. These competencies appear basic to all aspects of the work of school library media specialists and are judged essential by school administrators, teachers and school library media specialists themselves. (Shannon, 2002)

She found that research (Burks, 1993; Farwell, 1998; Hughes, 1998; Johnson, 1993) shows that “school library media specialists’ confidence, initiative, communication skills and leadership qualities were important factors for those who were active players in the total school curriculum and instructional program” (Shannon, 2002).

According to Brewer and Milam (2005), the results of a 2005 survey conducted by *School Library Journal* and ISTE, showed that “library media specialists are key players in creating schools befitting the 21st century. It’s up to the education leadership, as well as the community at large, to recognize, support, and fund their efforts.”

School Library Media Program Components

The main categories designated for school library program development outlined in *Information Power* (AASL & AECT, 1998) and reflected in the content of the AASL rubric are: (1) Teaching and Learning; (2) Information Access and Delivery; (3) Program Administration, and throughout are the themes of collaboration, leadership and technology (p. ix).

Information literacy instruction is relevant to program development that addresses teaching and learning and information access and delivery. According to the AASL/AECT *Information Power* guidelines (1998), to become information literate—that is, to be able to locate, evaluate and effectively use needed information, students must be exposed to many different resources within the context of curriculum content and have opportunities for inquiry and research that are embedded in, and thus relevant to learner needs.

Guided inquiry, the basis for the *AASL Standards for the 21st-Century Learner*, is at the heart of many school reform measures developed to address a critical need of

learners. The AASL standards “mirror the same foundational elements of successful learners being promoted by other educational consortia, including the Partnership for the 21st Century Skills (2004) and the International Society of Technology in Education (2000-02)” (Zmuda & Harada, 2008, p. 86).

Kuhlthau comments that, “few educators have recognized the power of the school library as an integral element in designing the information age school . . . even though recent studies have shown a significant impact of school libraries on student learning (Lance & Loertscher, 2001; Todd & Kuhlthau, 2005a, 2005b)” (Kuhlthau, Maniotes, & Caspari, 2007, p. 10). Another study by Todd, Kuhlthau, and Heinström (2005) suggests the additional impact of school libraries on student learning through assessment measures for inquiry learning. Part of the information literacy standards and the inquiry approach is the identification of learner needs and student learning through assessment (Harada & Yoshima, 2005; Kuhlthau; 2007). All is structured through existing curriculum and learning goals and involves “both short-term and long-term desires” (Marzano, Pickering & Pollock, 2001) and supports the idea that, according to Pressley and McCormick (1995), effective learners and thinkers use background knowledge, apply learning strategies, are mindful of their own thinking and are motivated.

Instructional goals of the library media program are articulated to help add focus that can then be modified by the student to meet personal needs and interests for learning. Ideally, the library media specialist works with classroom teachers to identify information literacy skills related to educational goals and objectives and integrates them into the plan for learning, thus fulfilling the roles of teacher, instructional partner, information specialist (AASL & AECT, 1998). Students are then given the opportunity to develop

questions, find resources, use resources and create new understanding while applying learning strategies. In this way, resources such as standards for library media programs and information literacy instruction, guidelines for collaborative practices and leadership skills, strategies and skills related to technology, as well as suggestions for assessment and evaluation are put into practice.

Administrators' Knowledge of Library Media Programs

It is important for school administrators to have an understanding of library media programs, including a grasp of the roles of the library media specialist and their place in the academic plan of the school (Campbell, 1994; Hartzell, 2002a; Oberg, Hay, & Henri, 2000; Rose, 2002). In a survey of 572 teacher-librarians and 423 principals (terms used in the survey), 90% of the librarians and 78% of the principals agreed that principals were inadequately trained in the management and function of school libraries (Wilson & Blake, 1993). Specifically, respondents indicated, school principals need to know: (a) school library standards and guidelines; (b) the school library's place in the total school program; (c) the access to computer and AV technology for the library; (d) routine tasks of teacher-librarians; and (e) the certification requirements of teacher-librarians (Wilson, & Blake, 1993). Roberson, Applin, and Schweinle (2005) recorded that 69% of the principals in Mississippi reported a void in their preparation concerning school libraries.

According to Wilson and Blake (1993), when respondents were asked if principal training should include information about the management and function of school libraries, 78% of the principals responded in the affirmative. In the same study, administrators (principals) offered suggestions for such training, including: (a) university

course work; (b) in-service seminars or training at the district or state level; (c) on-the-job experience (Wilson & Blake, 1993).

It is important for administrators to support effective library media programs and recognize the role teachers play in creating and sustaining strong library media programs. According to Hartzell (2002b), training programs still maintain and promote an ideology that there is one teacher per classroom with teachers acting independently of others; collaboration is not modeled or encouraged.

As Goodson (2000) indicates, teachers are central to successful change (p. 24). A study conducted by Kuhlthau (1993), examining successful implementation of a process approach to information skills in library media programs, found that one of the primary inhibitors for successful programs involved role confusion. Rather than finding new ways to work with the library media specialist, teachers assumed the traditional role of “assignment giver” when there was not time to find new ways to work together as a team (p.14).

In the same study, Kuhlthau found that enablers for successful programs involved a “team approach to teaching with administrators, teachers and library media specialists playing essential roles in the instructional team” (1993, p. 16). There must be a “shared commitment to teaching skills for lifelong learning and for motivating students to take responsibility for their own learning” (p. 16). There must be a “mutually held constructivist view of learning compatible with the process approach . . . engaging students in problem-driven inquiry” (p. 6).

In a 2003 survey conducted by *School Library Journal (SLJ)*, of the 783 school librarians surveyed, 64% reported the foremost barrier to integrating information literacy

instruction into the curriculum was lack of support by teachers (Whelan, 2003). The next highest barrier reported was teachers' insufficient knowledge of information literacy. Only 41% were perceived by school librarians to have an understanding of information literacy (p. 50). Traditionally, teachers and administrators have not been exposed to the kinds of library media programs proposed by the national standards for school libraries, nor are they well versed in the meaning of information literacy, the existence of information literacy standards, or the roles outlined for library media specialists.

According to several studies and surveys, conducted from 1989-2004, school principals at all levels, Pre-K through 12, know very little about managing or sustaining effective school library media programs and, therefore, are less likely to fund and support them (Campbell, 1991; Edwards, 1989; Wilson & Blake, 1993; Lau, 2002b; O'Neal, 2004). A national survey of "heads of departments of educational administration and professors of courses on principalship, supervision, or the curriculum" (Veltze, 1992, p. 131) revealed that 90% of the professors of educational administration surveyed did not see the principal as an important influence in teacher/librarian collaboration. This same group held a very positive attitude about school library media program information and 94% of them felt "schools would benefit if the school library media specialists were involved in curriculum development" (p. 132). This indicates a lack of understanding about the importance of collaboration related to involving school library media specialists in curriculum development (p. 132).

Support by the administrator is essential if the value of the library media program is to be recognized and capitalized upon, especially when the school library media specialist is not seen in a leadership capacity in the school setting (Wilson & Lyders,

2001). A 2003 Kentucky study reported fewer than 10% of the principals who responded had taken a college course that included content related to school library media specialist and principal collaboration (Alexander & Carey, 2003). The Kentucky study went on to show that principals who had participated in such course work “rated the library media center significantly higher, 7.00 on a 10-point scale, than the principals who had not taken a course, who rated the value of the library media center at 4.97” (p. 11). The finding of Alexander and Carey emphasizes the importance of providing formal training opportunities for administrators on library media programs. This is doubly important since administrators not only lack this kind of training in their administrative classes, but also lack this kind of information about school libraries in their teacher training courses.

Other studies point to the same conclusion. McNeil and Wilson (1999-2000) found, that 76% of 519 NCATE-accredited universities do not integrate any information about school libraries in courses required for principal preparation. Yet, a KRC Research study, done for AASL/ALA in 2003 reported “nearly all of the participants acknowledge that school libraries are important and have value to their school and to them personally” (p. 3). “Teachers and principals,” it said, “are most likely to see the value in school libraries and librarians—especially for students. However, most use it very little for their own purposes” (McNeil & Wilson, 1999-2000, p. 3).

Contrary to the positive comments of the KRC findings, a 2002 *School Library Journal* survey of 242 principals, found that only 41% believed that the school “library has a positive impact on student’s standardized test scores” (Lau, 2002b, p. 52), even though strong correlations have been established between student learning and school library programs through studies done in 19 states and 1 Canadian province (Scholastic,

2008). The studies, led by the work of Keith Curry Lance, have corroborated the significant educational role that library media specialists and quality school library media programs have played in the education of students (Library Research Service, 2008; U.S. National Commission on Libraries and Information Services, 2008). Research studies by Todd and Kuhlthau (2005a, 2005b) and by Todd et al. (2005) have also linked school libraries and the work of school library media specialists to student learning.

However, Blackett and Klinger (2006) suggest that even though significant correlations have been established showing school library media programs contribute to greater student achievement, there still remains “the inability to provide direct causal evidence” (p. 58). At the same time, correlations research should not be underestimated since it can identify relationships and degrees of association among variables. Cause-and-effect probability is strengthened if similar correlations appear in multiple settings over time, which is evident in the school library impact studies. A database search in ERIC, using the keyword “correlation,” brings up over 5,000 hits. Further investigation reveals that there are numerous examples of research in education, outside the library media field, that report correlations that have been found and deemed important.

Many of the school library impact studies focus on standardized reading test scores and suggest that higher scores are found in schools with up-to-date resources and technology, and an information literacy program integrated with classroom curriculum and collaboratively implemented with classroom teachers (Lance, 2002). Also, Lance emphasizes, studies in various states have demonstrated that differences such as total per pupil expenditures, poverty, minority demographics and adult educational attainment “do not explain away the importance of high-quality school libraries” (p. 78).

The Canadian study (Blackett & Klinger, 2006) which involved 22% of the total student population from 880 elementary schools in Ontario further supported the findings of the United States studies showing correlations between the presence of professional staffing of the library media center and higher student reading achievement scores (p. 57). Blackett and Klinger also reported that the presence of a library media specialist was the “single strongest predictor of reading enjoyment for both grades 3 and 6” and that lack of professional library staffing is associated with less positive attitudes toward reading enjoyment (p. 57).

The principals’ perceived “value of libraries” for students in the AASL KRC Research (AASL & ALA, 2003) seems illusive when not connected to student achievement or grounded in research; instead it seems to reflect more of a “feel good” reason for valuing libraries on the part of administrators. This reiterates the need for administrators to have more knowledge about school library media programs and related literature so they can provide informed, sustained support for such programs.

Informing School Administrators about School Library Media Programs

Despite the availability of many tools, resources and extensive literature for the development of school library media programs, as well as research about school libraries, the majority of administrators appear unaware that such standards and resources exist and remain uninformed about the potential of the library media program to actively contribute to academic achievement in the school.

School administrators are key to impacting change for school libraries, yet finding ways to inform them about school libraries remains a challenge. According to Hall and Hord (2006), Principle 7 of the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) for

organizational and educational settings, “Administrator leadership is essential to long-term change success” (p. 13). When advocating for bottom-up change Hall and Hord (2006) contend that those at the bottom can advocate for change but not without the ongoing support of administrators. They argue that such efforts will not be sustained since it is the administrators that must “secure the necessary infrastructure changes and long-term resource supports if use of an innovation is to continue indefinitely” (p. 13). The school administrator, as the CBAM model indicates, is pivotal as the building’s instructional leader, instituting policies and establishing priorities such as policies that directly impact school library media programs.

A study by Campbell (1991) revealed that much of what principals know about school libraries comes from their interaction with the library media specialist on the job in the school setting. When 333 principals responded to a survey, 39% of those surveyed selected responses that indicated they learned what they knew about school libraries from either their current or former library media specialists while only 8% learned what they knew from college coursework (p. 56). In an effort to provide information for principals about school libraries whenever possible, Alexander and Carey (2003) point out that it is important for library media specialists to “collaborate with principals and educate them about professional roles, responsibilities, and services” at every opportunity (p. 11).

Campbell (1991) made recommendations for the inclusion of coursework for school administrators that cover information on school library media programs, and calls for the sharing of information by school library media specialists with principals be more formalized. *Information Power* (AASL & AECT, 1998) the national guidelines for school libraries, states that a school library media specialist is responsible for initiating and

sustaining communications with the principal (p. 106). However, even where such time-intensive, continuing education and rapport-building takes place, job mobility, retirements, and promotions can pose challenges to the ongoing administrative support necessary to maintain quality school library media programs. Hartzell (2003) points out, while advocacy is an essential skill requirement of any school librarian, the individual effort is not enough, and is not a long-term solution.

Lewis (1990) examined the perceptions of North Carolina middle school principals and media coordinators regarding the school library media program and its role in the middle school. She concluded that both principals and library media specialists thought there were unrealized aspects to their programs when compared to national program standards. For example, they indicated that library media specialists were not involved in delivery of professional development for teachers; library media specialists did not work to locate resources outside the school; and that sufficient professional development for library media specialist in the area of media and technology were not being provided (p. 144). Lewis reported that another standard not being realized to the extent desired was teachers and library media specialists planning together (p. 145). The study also revealed differences in the perceptions of library media specialists and principals regarding how two of the three roles defined in the national standards were being fulfilled.

According the 1998 AASL/AECT library media program standards, library media specialists, in the role of Information Specialist, are expected to make resources available in and outside the school for students and staff; provide a reliable retrieval system for resources; and assist students in finding, locating and using information. In the second

role, as Instructional Consultant, library media specialists are to participate in the development of curriculum and assessment; work with teachers to facilitate the use of resources, acquire resources; and integrate information skills within the content curriculum (AASL/AECT, 1998). Lewis found that principals did not perceive library media specialists serving as information specialists to the degree that library media specialists thought they were fulfilling this role related to selection of resources (1990, p. 147).

In contrast, principals thought that the library media specialists were serving as instructional consultants (collaborative partners) to a greater degree than did the library media specialists (Lewis, 1990). Library media specialists thought the instructional consultant role was being reduced to “providing information upon request” (p. 147) rather than being actualized through instructional planning involvement with teachers. Focus group transcripts indicated that these opposing interpretations could be linked to library media specialists having a more detailed understanding of the roles outlined in the national standards (p. 147). Lewis concluded,

Since institutions of higher education do not include in administrator and teacher training programs instruction about the appropriate role of the library media program in the middle school instructional process, principals and teachers learn about good practices directly by experience, indirectly by conversations with others, reading professional literature, and/or participating in staff development activities. Many principals admit that ‘good media coordinators’ have taught them what an exemplary library media program is supposed to be. Many others have never experienced an exemplary program nor have they received any formal instruction. (pp. 152-153)

Rather than leave such learning to chance, Lewis (1990) suggests that information about exemplary library media programs should be included in the content of established,

required courses for administrators (p. 153). According to Hambleton and Wilkinson (1994), the courses need to address the role of the principal in the development of school library programs and services.

Challenges of the Change Process

Another consideration, beyond the knowledge or lack of knowledge that administrators possess about library media programs is the challenges that face them when it comes to making changes that impact the role of the library media specialist and the library program in their schools. Such decisions are influenced by the nature of change in educational settings and how attempts to alter the nature or status of library media programs in schools might be impacted.

Change researcher and theorist Peter Senge (1999) argues, “If we do not change [our most basic ways of thinking], any new ‘input’ will end up producing the same fundamentally unproductive types of actions” (p. 6). He comments that most innovations lose momentum and are not fully realized. He likens this pattern to growth in nature, for example the growth of a tree, for a tree, “not enough water, nutrients, or space for the root system—could potentially keep the seed from growing” (p. 8). The same can happen with educational change initiatives, and it is problematic when the leadership of the administrator is considered the main agent for change. The concept that administrators have the sole power to orchestrate change is a myth; it is what Smith (2002) refers to as the “messianic theory of change management. . . . All you need is a savior who will lead the organization into the promised land” (p. 31).

Although a strong, charismatic leader contributes to success, to be effective, leadership must come from many different people. Secondly, Senge contends, change

must be supported by education and understanding so that those elements that encourage change can be recognized and utilized, although he emphasizes that “building learning capabilities is necessary, but not sufficient” (1999, p. 9). Participants must also be able to recognize barriers and limitations to change. In summary, for the momentum of change to be sustained, new information must be established, many people must be involved and invested in the process, and strategies for altering practices must be accompanied by understanding what serves to limit as well as empower the progress toward change. This is what Senge calls “the dance of change” (p. 10).

Goodson (2000) contends that when addressing change in educational settings, “so central is the teachers’ role that change theories and projects, which ignore the personal, are bound to end up wide of their target” (p. 22). Teacher investment is essential to successful and sustainable change. He claims that developing a community awareness of reform is “the most neglected aspect of change theory” (p. 24).

Another aspect of change that must be addressed is how to sustain the progress made toward change. Smith (2002) warns that if efforts are not made to manage change, the tendency is to revert to the former way of doing things (p. 31). In a 1994 study, Campbell examined the high school principal’s role in “mainstreaming information-finding skills and to discover whether the change implementation themes associated with successful school innovation were applicable to the mainstreaming process” (p. 170). In this study, two case studies were analyzed and revealed how two principals “nurture the will and skill of key actors to provide all students with the opportunity for learning and practicing information skills” (p. 176).

The first step is awareness building related to the importance of information literacy skill instruction, how it can be mainstreamed and how it is linked to the role of the library media program in the school's curriculum (Campbell, 1994, p. 177). Campbell goes on to establish the need for skill-building, "the process by which a person is empowered to act on what is valued" (p. 178). According to Campbell,

Principals must, design new organizational structures to accommodate information literacy instruction, build collaborative work environment which allows actors to lead from their individual and collective areas of expertise, deal with the creative tension associated with continuous change, communicate effectively with other stakeholders, and share leadership them. (p. 178)

This links to Kuhlthau's research on attributes of programs that successfully implement a process approach to information literacy that suggests the importance of the team approach involving administrators, teachers and library media specialists "playing essential roles in the instructional team" (1993, p. 16). It is also supported by Senge's theory of change that involves many different people and is supported with education and understanding (1999, p. 9).

Campbell (1994) concludes that schools have become environments where change is the norm, and more needs to be understood about the nature of change in effective schools, the impact of change on educators, and how school leaders contend with change in relationship to accountability (p. 180). In Campbell's study, the important role of the principal was well established, "The findings cast the principals as generative transformers of program, people and organizational structure. Through the initiation and implementation process, they set in motion synergies which built the will and technical

capacity of their staffs to mainstream integrated information skill instruction” (Campbell, 1994, p. 181).

Summary of the Review of Literature

Many studies have indicated that administrators lack knowledge about school libraries and the role of school library media specialists in education. Administrators do not see library media specialists in a leadership capacity in the school. They are not aware of national standards for library media programs or information literacy standards. Recommendations from numerous studies have called for opportunities for administrators to be provided with better background knowledge about school library media programs and the role of library media specialists so they can make informed decisions for library program development and integration as well as serve as advocates for school libraries.

Lack of information about school libraries impairs administrators’ abilities to support and promote library programs in their schools in an informed and productive way. The literature indicates that methods of providing school administrators with information necessary to build and support library media programs and support library media specialists must be devised. These solutions must include strategies that can be used to implement and sustain change for school library media programs.

Chapter3

Research Design and Methodology

Introduction

This chapter provides discussion and presentation of the research methods used for this study. Background information about the study and the Mansfield online course “School Library Advocacy for Administrators,” is presented followed by information about the role of the researcher and the participants. Methodology is presented as well as how the data was gathered and analyzed, and how the results are reported.

Background

The research design was mixed methods and used both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative methods were used for the collection of data through surveys, action plans, feedback sheets and demographic information. Qualitative, descriptive/phenomenological methods were employed to gain understanding of the experiences of participants through a semi-structured interview process while integrating information from the other data. Because standardized responses alone (e.g., surveys, feedback sheets, evaluations) were not sufficient to accommodate individual, subjective differences, the use of interviews contributed to a more complex understanding of the participants’ perceptions (Seidman, 1998). The interviews provided a better understanding of the how participants’ made meaning of their experiences related to a Mansfield University online course and implementing their action plans (Seidman, 1998). As a result, the chosen mixed methods research approach took advantage of multiple

sources of information that added depth to the interpretation (Greene & Caracelli, 1997 p. 10).

The study involved 13 participants who completed the online advocacy course, "School Library Advocacy for Administrators," offered by Mansfield University in Pennsylvania during the summer of 2005 and the fall of 2006. This research examined the changes, if any, in administrators' perceptions and actions related to school library media programs following completion of the online library advocacy course.

Administrators who enrolled in the Mansfield course were required to have Internet access and commit approximately 15 hours over a five-week period of time. Enrollees were required to complete a course pre-survey asking for demographic information as well as information about their library media programs, four module evaluation surveys and a post-survey with questions pertaining to the content and structure of the online course as well as questions about changed expectations and behaviors related to their library media programs. They also completed four weekly modules with readings, participated in three online, asynchronous discussions with colleagues and the instructor, and developed an action plan to improve the school library media program.

Those enrolled had the option of earning one graduate credit and continuing education hours/credit by enrolling and paying tuition and fees or if they were recruited to take the course by a Mansfield library media student, they could take the course free of cost without graduate credit. There was an application fee of \$25.00. Typically, course materials cost approximately \$150 unless a Mansfield student

recruited the administrator, then no fees were assessed and the materials were free. In addition, the Mansfield student was eligible to receive a scholarship for recruiting an administrator to take the online course, all of which is discussed at more length in Chapter 4.

The course was offered beginning in 2003 by Mansfield University and subsequently in 2005 and 2006. It was originally developed with a grant from the Institute for Museum and Library Services (IMLS) to educate school administrators to create and foster quality school library media programs (Kachel, 2006). The content of the course is outlined as follows: (see Appendix A and Appendix C)

Module 1: The School Library & Academic Achievement

- Research studies
- Factors of a quality school library media program
- Purpose and mission of the school library media program
- Four roles of the library media specialist

Module 2: Information Literacy and Academic Standards

- Defining information literacy
- Using an information problem-solving process model
- Connecting information literacy and state academic standards
- Collaborating among teachers and the library media specialist

Module 3: The Library Collection and Flexible Access

- Supporting the curriculum with library media resources
- Establishing a reading habit among students

- Establishing guidelines for a quality library media collection
- Scheduling library media instructional activities

Module 4: Revitalization and Evaluation of the Library Media Program

- Staffing the school library media program
- Recruiting, mentoring, retaining library media specialists
- Observing and evaluating the library media specialist and the program
- Documenting instructional activities in the library media center

Week 5: Action Planning

- Administrators complete a “13 Point Checklist” worksheet evaluating the library media program and selecting seven areas of weakness selected from the checklist (see Appendix D). Administrators then develop an action plan for their library media programs (see Appendix E). They then write one or more objectives that could be realistically accomplished to improve each area of weakness.

Role of the Researcher and Context

Several factors placed me as the researcher *inside* the context of the study and influenced what I brought to the study in terms of background, experience and knowledge. All were considerations in terms of my involvement in the study. My background is deeply rooted in education, beginning as a certified teacher of K-6, and later acquiring a Master’s degree in educational administration with a library media endorsement K-12.

I worked as a school library media specialist at the elementary and middle levels and as an administrator of library media services at the district level for a large school district for a total of 25 years. I have had close involvement with the implementation of national guidelines for school library media programs through a DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Library Power grant in my district, and have played an active role in school library professional organizations at the state and national levels. I have acquired a philosophy that aligns closely with that of the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) and have applied many of the tenets of that philosophy in my work at the school and district level and in my current work as an editor for publications on school libraries.

My background has both strengths and constraints. On the one hand, it helps me understand the language and issues associated with both the library media and the administrative viewpoints. Experience and background has given me the ability to knowledgeably communicate with administrators and work with them in many capacities. Involvement with and implementing library media programs at all levels has helped me understand AASL published documents both in depth and breadth and apply them to my work. On the other hand, these abilities pose constraints because my greater experience-base is related to school libraries, and I have a strong understanding of and identification with this topic. These predispositions could have interfered with my ability to hear what administrators had to say about library media programs in their educational setting and may have limited my ability to recognize how library media programs often work in practice.

Thus, it was important for me to put aside assumptions and recognize potential bias while also acknowledging that other factors did provide distance for me from school

libraries. For example, the virtual nature of the study and my lack of familiarity with any of the school library media programs, administrators, or the districts involved in the study provided distance, so I could be more objective. Also, a change in professional job assignment, to a position outside of education starting in summer 2005 provided additional distance from the school setting and afforded different and new perspectives, helping to lessen my potential bias. Recognizing and stating potential bias and the clarification of the nature of that bias help me as a researcher establish preconceptions and recognize how they might affect the study (Creswell, 2003).

Previously conducted studies, done in conjunction with quantitative and qualitative course work, have served as beneficial background experiences for me in this research endeavor. A qualitative study I previously conducted involving interviews provided an experience that enhanced the interview process used for this research. Planning and conducting this research study was accomplished by working closely with committee members, a professor emeritus of educational administration, and a university librarian. All provided research advice and feedback as the study progressed. Care was also taken to record all research measures adhered to throughout the course of the study. Expert checks by persons with varied philosophical views of school libraries and from outside the school field (e.g., an academic librarian, professor of educational administration) provided feedback throughout the process of the study and member checks with participants via email facilitated participant verification in terms of accuracy in descriptions, narration and reports (Creswell, 2003).

Participants

As stated in Chapter 1, the 13 participants in the study came from 9 different states and 5 different regions of the United States. They were also from schools of all sizes and grade levels. Two of the participants did work in the same school district. Participants were in buildings that ranged from approximately 100 students to 2,000 students, and they represented elementary, middle and high school buildings. There was 1 parochial school and 12 public schools represented. The percentages for free and reduced lunch ranged from 3% to 78%. For the most part, full time library media specialists were assigned to these buildings and had predominantly fixed schedules (see Appendix P). The participants had been administrators from 1 to 9 years and had worked with their current library media specialist from 1 to 10 years (see Appendix O).

The setting for the study was the online course offered by Mansfield University in Mansfield, Pennsylvania. The selection of the study participants was determined by their enrollment in and completion of the Mansfield University online course, their consent to participate in the study and the presence, in their buildings, of a library media specialist who also consented to participate. The library media specialist had to be certified or in the process of certification to be part of the study. Each administrator was required to complete all Mansfield course work and complete the online survey developed for the study. Each library media specialist also had to complete a version of the same online survey.

The participants in the study enrolled in the online course at the request of either a library media specialist in their building, in another building in their district, or by invitation of other teachers in their building seeking a library media endorsement through

the Mansfield University program. There were 13 Mansfield library media endorsement students: 4 were teachers that invited administrators in other buildings in the district to take the course, 1 was a student teacher for the library media specialist in the same building as a participating administrator, 8 were library media specialists seeking endorsement in the same building as the administrator.

Ten of the students who recruited administrators for the course were scholarship students. They recruited the administrators to take the course so they could receive scholarships for their Mansfield endorsement program. Three were non-scholarship students in the Mansfield program. Administrators taking the online course, whether invited by scholarship or non-scholarship students, received \$500 in staff development funds for their buildings upon completion of the course. All funding was provided through the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) grant awarded to Mansfield.

During the enrollment periods for the 2005 and 2006 Mansfield online course, 40 administrators registered. Twenty of the 40 actually completed the course during the time period of 2005 and 2006, and 3 finished at a later date. In the end, 23 of the original 40 completed the online course and 17 did not (see Appendix Q).

Of all participants who completed the course from the 2005 and 2006, 13 agreed to participate in the study via consent forms; 9 of the 13 participants were chosen for the interviews by what Mertens (2005) refers to as a *purposeful* sample, “a combination of sampling strategies such that subgroups are chosen based on specified criteria, and a sample of cases is then selected within those strata” (p. 319).

For this study purposeful sampling was used to select participants for the interviews. Interview participants were selected from different educational settings (e.g., elementary and secondary), different sized student populations, varied staffing of the library media centers (e.g., part-time and full-time library media specialists), and on participants' higher and lower self-rating of knowledge related to course content. The self-ratings reflected what the participants knew or did not know prior to completing the course modules and rated their retention of the content after completing the module.

Purposeful sampling allowed for a diversity that was important to the study (Mertens, 2005, p. 317) and supported variety in participants interviewed (Stake, 1994). The candidates from each course were contacted from the subgroups as possible participants in the interviews. There were nine participants from the subgroups that agreed to be interviewed; each signed a consent form and interviews were scheduled. Administrators who had extremes in staffing levels of their library media center, varied student populations, different staffing ratios and varying levels of self perceived knowledge of the course content provided for more understanding of the effects of the online course when one participant's experience was compared to another.

Of the 4 out of 7 participants selected for the interviews from the 2005 group, 1 was a middle school administrator for grades 6-8, 2 were elementary administrators for grades K-5, and 1 was an elementary administrator for grades K-6. Two administrators had library media specialists that were part-time, assigned to their buildings 2 days a week, and the other 2 had library media specialists that were full time in their buildings. Two of the administrators rated themselves as lacking knowledge of module content prior to the online course.

Of the 5 out of 6 participants selected for the interviews from the 2006 group, 1 was an elementary-middle school administrator for grades PreK-8, 1 was a middle-high school administrator for grades 7-12, 1 was a high school administrator for grades 9-12, and 2 were elementary administrators, 1 at a PreK-4 school and 1 at a school for grades 1-3. One administrator had a library media specialist that was part-time, assigned to the library media center 4 days a week, and the others had full-time library media specialists. Four of the administrators chosen for interviews rated themselves as lacking knowledge of module content prior to the online course.

In summary, the 9 participants interviewed represented schools with a variety of grade levels, as well as varied library media center staffing and scheduling options, and varied knowledge of the online course content. The administrators' schools ranged from preschool to high school and 3 of the 9 schools had part-time library media specialists while 6 of the 9 had full time library media specialists. Six of the library media centers had fixed-schedules while 2 had flexible schedules and 1 had a combination. Six of the participants interviewed rated themselves as knowing less than 50% of the content prior to taking the online course and 3 participants rated themselves as knowing more than 50% of the content before taking the online course.

Methodology

Beginning in fall of 2004, I contacted Mansfield University through the professor of the online course. The Chair of the School Library and Information Technologies department at Mansfield provided access to the course and permission to recruit participants for the study (see Appendix F).

In May 2005, initial contact was made with those enrolled in the summer 2005 online course and the same was done in summer 2006 for those enrolled the fall 2006 online course. Cover letters, consent forms and general and demographic surveys were mailed to all enrollees (see Appendix G and Appendix H). Consent forms from the administrators were secured along with permission to contact their library media specialists. The library media specialists were then contacted and cover letters and consent forms were sent and signed consent forms were returned (see Appendix I).

As previously stated, study participants were 13 administrators that signed consent forms, completed the Mansfield online course requirements, and completed the online survey(s) for the study. The first group of 7 administrators participated in the course in the summer of 2005, and the second group of 6 administrators took the course in fall of 2006. Out of the 13 administrators that participated, 9 agreed to be interviewed. In addition, 13 library media specialists signed consent forms to participate in the study by completing the online survey.

The general-demographic survey sent to the administrator participants was used to gather data using a combination of fill-in-the-blank, Likert-scale ratings and open-ended responses. This instrument was originally developed by the online course professor to gather data needed for Mansfield University (e.g., student enrollment, grade range, socio-economic level, background information about the library media center collection, staffing, etc.) (see Appendix H). The demographic data were used for this study to indicate if there was variance according to school settings, e.g., elementary or secondary, size and geographic location. Other information from the general survey was used to complement and extend the profiles created for each participant of the study.

An online survey was also developed for the study and was completed by administrators and library media specialists participating in the study. Slight modifications were made in wording to accommodate differences in respondents (i.e., library media specialist vs. administrator) (see Appendix J). The online surveys were comprised of statements consistent with the content of the online course and current literature concerning library media program development and evaluation. Respondents were instructed to check a four-point Likert-scale, ranging from Very Important to Not Important.

The questions for the surveys were developed to correlate with the content of the four modules from the online course. Experts, including two professors of library science with background experience as school librarians, a professor of educational administration and a school district program evaluator, provided feedback on the questions and helped develop the survey. Four administrators in a graduate course at a local university and the professor completed the survey and also gave feedback for changes and improvement.

A survey analysis was also conducted for internal consistency on 77 variables from the online survey instrument (3 variables, items 47-49 on the survey, were eliminated due to poor construction resulting in unreliable responses). The analysis revealed high internal consistency with a high raw alpha score of 0.947088 and a standardized score of 0.946299 (see Table 1).

Table 1

Cronbach Coefficient Alpha

Variables	Alpha
Raw	0.947088
Standardized	0.946299

The survey was administered online via *SurveyMonkey.com*. It was intended that study participants in 2005 and 2006 would take the online survey before and after completing the online course as a pre- and post-evaluation instrument. Several of the 2005 participants had problems logging on to take the pre-survey, a problem that could not be corrected before the course was underway. Thus, the 2005 participants completed only the post-survey.

In 2006, administrators took the online survey before starting and after completing the online course, which allowed for comparison of their pre- and post-responses. Their pre- and post-survey responses were also compared to the post-survey responses of administrators from the 2005 group. All administrators' post-survey responses were compared to the responses of the library media specialists. The results will be further examined in Chapters 4 and 5.

The 2005 course work was finalized in early August, and administrators were contacted in the spring of 2006 to participate in the interviews and sign consent forms. The 2006 course work was finalized in January, and administrators were contacted in the spring of 2007 to participate in interviews and sign consent forms (see Appendix J). After completing the online course, administrators of both groups were selected for interviews

based on their responses to a course self-assessment completed after each module of the online course and their school demographics (see Appendix K).

A three-series, semi-structured interview process was used for the interviews (Seidman, 1998). The interviews were scheduled at the convenience of the administrators at 7 to 10 day intervals. The interviews were 30-45 minutes in length and were conducted via the telephone, tape recorded and followed with complete transcription after every interview so I could review each transcript and listen to the tape before the next interview. Interviews were completed by late July 2006 for the first group and mid-July 2007 for the second group (see Appendix R).

Due to the virtual nature of course participation and the geographic location of each participant, telephone interviews were the chosen option. Interviews enabled me as the researcher to gain additional insight on the participants' experience with the online course and how they were following through on their action plans (Seidman, 1998). Because the focus of the project was the individual perceptions of the administrators, the importance of the verbatim recording of the interviews was paramount. Voice recordings of the interviews were used to preserve participants' remarks and allowed the most accurate transcriptions for later use in the text of the study. This technique allowed me to avoid paraphrasing and provided original data that could be referred to for clarification and accuracy.

Good (1966) identifies basic advantages of voice recording in interviews and these were used as the rationale for the interview format used in this study. First, no word is lost in a voice-recorded interview; the interviewer avoids bias through selective (conscious or unconscious) note taking. Patton (1990) echoes this as an important feature;

voice recording allows the researcher to focus on the person being interviewed; voice recordings are an efficient use of time, allowing the researcher to record everything said which would not be possible when taking notes (p. 242).

Patton (1990) emphasizes that voice recording does not give license to be less attentive than one would be otherwise. Wolcott (2003) presents an extended argument against the use of voice recording in general educational ethnographic research, but does support it for interviews because it captures accurate accounts of what was asked by the interviewer and the responses of the participants.

Data Collection

The data were gathered by means of surveys (online and demographic/general), course feedback and self-assessment forms, action plans and interviews. Data were also gathered from the Mansfield course surveys (e.g., course module surveys, course content post-survey) developed and administered by the Mansfield online course instructor. Additional data were gathered from an online survey developed for the study and administered to study participants through *SurveyMonkey.com*. The action plans were completed as a course requirement. Data collection from the interviews consisted of voice recordings and field notes, and each was transcribed verbatim. Profiles of each participant in the study were created from the interview transcripts, course feedback forms, course self-assessment forms, course evaluation forms and course demographic/general pre-survey and action plans.

Participants were interviewed over the course of four to five weeks (unexpected events caused two of the participants to reschedule interviews). Each interview was

30-40 minutes in length in accordance with the agreement made with the administrators and as described in the informed consent (see Appendix R).

The interviews were scheduled at the convenience of the administrators and were conducted via telephone. A formal interview schedule was used with interviews conducted at scheduled time slots and recorded for later transcription (Siedman, 1998). The format of the interviews was semi-structured guided questions. I, as the interviewer, asked more probing questions when I responded to the participant. The interviews were in-depth, delving significantly into the perspective and understanding of the participant. Interview guidelines were developed and adjusted based on the transcripts to guide subsequent interviews (see Appendix M).

The topics explored through the interviews were thematic in nature and related back to the overarching research question. The topics explored were:

1. online course experience and information about the administrators' building library media programs;
2. action plans, accomplishments, involvement of others; and
3. focused objectives from the evaluation checklist for library media programs, more about the action plans and future plans for the library media program.

Although each of the three interviews had a different focus, questions were also included that reviewed topics already covered in a somewhat different way, helping to clarify understanding. The first interview established context of the administrator's experience and focused on having him or her tell as much as possible about taking the online course (Seidman, 1998). The second interview allowed each administrator to reconstruct the specific details of his or her experience related to implementing his or her

action plan for the library media program. The last interview focused on encouraging each participant to examine the items designated for attention from the 13 Point Checklist. This third interview also gave an opportunity for the administrator to reflect on the meaning of his or her experience in taking the online course and implementing the action plan (see Appendix M).

Questions for subsequent interviews were framed after reviewing the transcripts from interviews already conducted. If there were comments that needed clarifying, questions were added to the interview guide for the next interview, or if there were topics that needed more explanation, questions were added to the list for the next interview.

An experienced transcriber recorded all voice-recorded interviews and each transcription was completed before the next interview was conducted. I listened to each tape and followed along with the transcription to facilitate review, clarify content and better understand the responses as a means of preparing for the next interview. Notes taken during the interviews were used to add context to the transcriptions and profiles were created for each participant.

The data for the online surveys were collected through *SurveyMonkey.com*. The administrators from the 2005 online course took the post-survey online, while the administrators from the 2006 online course took the pre- and post-survey online. The library media specialists each took the online survey that matched the administrator's pre- and post-survey; language was adapted to fit their perspective as a library media specialist (see Appendix L).

Data Analysis

This is a mixed methods study using quantitative, “close-ended data” and “open-ended qualitative data . . . to best understand a research problem” (Creswell, 2003, p. 22). A phenomenological approach was used to analyze interview transcripts and feedback sheets and identify themes. The quantitative survey items, self-rating surveys and demographics were used to gain a broader understanding of participants’ perspectives beyond the other data. Data analysis began with the design of the study and continued through the transcription and coding of the data and reporting.

After the study was underway, I compiled demographic and general survey information from administrator participants and library media specialist participants. Through the interview process, I revisited transcripts and notes in preparation for subsequent interviews. After the interviews were completed, I got an overall sense of the data by reading through all collected information (Creswell, 1998), and then I created profiles for each administrator participant. The process of creating the profiles allowed triangulation of the data as I referred back to the voice recordings of the interviews, the transcripts, my notes, the general survey questions, the action plan and the course self-assessment and feedback forms.

The comments made by the administrators in the interviews were upheld by written comments they made on the feedback sheets and often served to expand the information. This provided reinforcement and clarification of what the participants were conveying about their impressions, new perspectives and information gained from the course. The process helped me become intimately acquainted with the data and validate it. After the profiles were created for those interviewed, I emailed the document to each

administrator participant for member check (see Appendix M). All replied that the profiles were acceptable and one person asked for a correction in one statement.

Further analysis of the data involved open coding, axial coding, selective coding and constant comparison (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The coding provided interpretive analysis with notes and memos created as the data was examined and inductive analysis done through the identification of semantic relationships (Hatch, 2002).

The process of open coding began by sorting the profiles to color-code words helping to record first impressions (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). From the color-coded words, word walls were created to help make connections between the words and characteristics later used to identify categories and themes (see Table 2). During this process, notes were created related to the impressions to “articulate the interpretations” (Hatch, 2002, p. 182). At this point they became written notes to me. The open coding

Table 2

Word Wall for Role of the Administrator

Enable	Facilitate	Listen	Integrate
Lead	Encourage	Lead	Improve
Communicate	Inspire	Involve	Evaluate
Administer	Envision	Understand	Assess
Teach	Goals	Advocate	Coordinate
Knowledgeable	Awareness	Ignite	Share
Promote	Evolve	Plan	Meet
Showcase	Require	Create	Prioritize
Develop	Available	Show	Accessible

along with the notes were revisited to begin the process of better identifying impressions interpreted from the data related to the research question. This was done using axial coding which involved going back through the coded data and identifying categories and subcategories in an attempt to pull the pieces together and identify specific themes (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) (see Table 3; the complete example can be found in the Appendix T).

Table 3

Excerpt of Interpretive Impressions

1. Administrator as an enabler:

It seems the administrator is listing many characteristics that establish his or her role as an enabler for the library media specialist and the library media program.

Enabler—a person who gives support needed; provides access to resources, people; provides time and budget, facilitates access to staff, empowers others.

2. Administrator as a leader:

It seems an important role of the administrator is as a leader in setting expectations for the library media program.

Leader—a person who communicates expectations; raises awareness; assists in guiding the program, provides reasons.

The open coding process gave a sense of what the participants were conveying, and it also facilitated the identification of emerging categories. Depending on the administrator, the lists had similarities and differences. This facilitated inductive analysis

by using semantic relationships for domain analysis. Domains are a set of categories of meaning “that reflects relationships represented in the data” (Hatch, 2002, p. 164). This is a process where categories are identified and “organized around relationships” (p. 165). As the semantic relationships were then identified within the data they were used to further understand the data and to confirm relationships established from the word walls and identified categories (see Table 4).

Table 4

Semantic Relationships

X is a way to do Y:	X is characteristic of Y:	X is a reason for doing Y:	X is used for Y:
Providing staff development for teachers <i>will make</i> them more <i>aware</i> of the importance of the library media program for student learning.	X is a reason for doing Y: Student learning is a reason for supporting information literacy instruction.	Meeting the learning needs of students <i>is a reason for</i> flexible scheduling.	Assignment of the library media specialist to the School Improvement Committee is <i>used to</i> show how the library media center is integral to the school academic plan.

This process was then used to foster the establishment of themes, confirming that they were based on information that originated from the data and related back to the research questions. For example, the word wall “Role of Administrator” represents words used by administrator participants for characteristics of the administrators’ role with regard to the library media program. These words came to represent “role of the administrator” as a theme identifiable throughout the data in the responses of the administrators (see Table 5).

Table 5

Open Coding Example

Emerging Topics
Role of the library media specialist Role of the administrator Benefits for students Professional development Online course Content Things learned Action Plans: Inservice for teachers—technology skills Professional development for the library media specialist Collaboration expectations

The categories were reorganized by more axial coding followed by selective coding where concepts were brought together around more selective themes (e.g., changed expectations for the library media specialist and the program; improved ability to communicate; better awareness of the role of the administrator) (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The data was revisited once again to see how these relationships were supported via quotes and statements from the participants. This allowed the categories to be further combined and prioritized in a way that seemed more conducive to communicating the nature of the administrators’ perspectives toward school library media programs as described in Chapters 4 and 5. It was important to look back at the original study questions throughout the process of analysis to make sure the work answered the questions.

Standardized Data

Standardized or quantitative “close-ended” data (Creswell, 2003, p. 22) were used to gain a broader understanding of information about administrator participants. This data

was collected and compiled from information on the demographic-general survey items and module surveys (see Appendix K and Appendix H). Data was also gathered from the Mansfield University Course Feedback Survey that provided a rating of course content and level of learning in an online environment (see Appendix K).

The Mansfield University Evaluation Surveys for each of the four course modules were filled out after each module was completed. These responses provided more standardized data from the administrator participants regarding what they knew prior to taking the online course compared to what they knew after taking the online course. Analysis of this data was accomplished by calculating the responses using percentages as points of comparison (see Appendix K). The same was done with data where participants were asked to rate the level of learning in an online environment (see Appendix K).

Information from the general-demographic survey was quantified to provide school, staffing and demographics as well as personal demographics for each administrator. Information about the administrator participants' previous coursework related to school libraries was also provided (see Appendix H). The Course Feedback Survey provided standardized responses to questions about the importance of the online course content and if the content should be included in course work to earn a Principal's Certificate (see Appendix K).

Data analysis of the online surveys was done using SAS (Statistical Analysis System). Descriptive statistics are shown in Appendix N. The data include frequency and percent of responses and item means for administrator and library media specialist responses to the online survey developed for the study. The means from each group responding to the survey were compared and there was so little variation, no further

analysis was run. As stated previously, a survey analysis was conducted for internal consistency on survey instrument that revealed high internal consistency (see Table 1).

Summary

This is a mixed methods study, using quantitative, “close-ended data” and “open-ended qualitative data . . . to best understand a research problem” (Creswell, 2003, p. 22). A phenomenological approach was used to analyze interview transcripts and feedback sheets, identifying themes. The data were gathered by means of surveys (online and demographic/general), course feedback and self-assessment forms, action plans and interviews.

Quantitative analysis involved open coding, axial coding, selective coding, constant comparison (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) and inductive analysis using semantic relationships and interpretive analysis through coding and memos (Hatch, 2002). All were used to identify emerging topics and themes in the data related to the research questions. Standardized data from the various course surveys were compiled and reported and data analysis of the online surveys was done using SAS (Statistical Analysis System).

Chapter 4

Presentation of the Data

Introduction

This chapter will report the findings related to the research focus—when school administrators are given in-depth knowledge provided by research as well as frameworks of the profession on school library media programs, in what ways do they perceive they gained information, changed their perceptions or changed their actions toward the library media programs in their buildings?

Findings are related to the administrator participants' knowledge of the content covered in the Mansfield University online course, "School Library Advocacy for Administrators," before and after completing the course. Findings will be reported that address three themes from the data: (a) the administrators' changed expectations for the library media program and the role of the library media specialist, (b) the administrators' improved communications related to the library media program, and (c) expanded awareness of the administrator's role with regard to the library media program. Perceptions of the action plans and data from the online surveys completed by the administrators who participated in the Mansfield online course will be presented.

Administrators' Level of Preparation Related to School Library Media Programs

Before beginning the course, "School Library Advocacy for Administrators," each participating administrator completed the General and Demographic Information Survey. All were asked if the coursework for their administrative degree addressed ways to develop and evaluate school library media programs (see Appendix H). Twelve of the

13 (92%) administrators that consented to participate in this study answered “no” and one answered “yes” but did not specify the content covered in the course (see Appendix W).

Administrator participants in the study subsequently completed a Mansfield Course Feedback Survey after finishing Module 4 of the online course (see Appendix K). Each participant was asked if information about developing and evaluating a school library program should be included in the course work to earn a principal’s certificate. Eleven of the 13 answered the question, and all responded “yes.” When the 9 administrator participants were later interviewed, they were asked if they had received training in the management and function of school libraries in their administrative coursework. Eight responded that they had not and one person stated he had taken a budgeting class that mentioned libraries.

The Mansfield Course Feedback Survey also asked participants about the importance of information learned in the online course. Six administrator participants in the study replied that the information was “Extremely Important,” five indicated it was “Important,” and one indicated it was “Somewhat Important,” and one participant did not respond to the question. For the 12 who answered, 92% indicated the content of the online course was “Important” to “Extremely Important” on the five-point scale (see Appendix W).

Levels of Learning in an Online Environment

Administrator participants were split in their opinions when asked on the Mansfield Course Feedback Survey to rate the level of learning when taking a course in an online environment. The online environment was rated as “Better than face to face” by 1 participant; “Same as a face-to-face class” by 5 participants, and “Less than a face-to-

face class” by 6 participants. One person did not fill out that portion of the survey. Of the 12 that responded, 50% rated it “Better” or the “Same” as a face-to-face class and 50% rated it as “Less” than a face-to-face class (see Appendix X).

Although the respondents rated the online environment as providing less learning than a face-to-face class, they rated the course content very high. Again, 1 person did not fill out this portion of the survey, but for the 12 who did, 50% rated the modules as “Extremely Important,” 42% rated it as “Very Important,” and 1 person rated it a “Somewhat Important” (see Appendix X).

When asked to assign a general rating on the specific content for the four modules, 92% of the participants rated Module 2, Information Literacy and Academic Standards, as “Excellent.” In their rating of Module 3—Collection & Flexible Access, 75% of the respondents rated it as “Excellent” and 67% rated Module 1—School Library & Academic Achievement and Module 4—Revitalization & Evaluation of the SLMP as “Excellent.” One person rated Module 1 as “Not Really helpful or useful to me” (see Table 6).

Administrator Knowledge of Online Course Content

After completing each of the Modules 1-4, participants were asked to rate their knowledge of the content prior to the course and after taking the course (see Table 7).

Module 1 dealt with the general topic of the school library and links to academic achievement. Objectives 1A and 1B of the module dealt with research literature related to school library media programs and the role of library media specialists. Only 38% of the 13 participants rated themselves as knowing the information for these objectives before

Table 6

Online Course Content Rating

Online course content rating

Considering the content and objectives of each mod as listed in the preceding chart, rate the four mods.

1 = Excellent content that I can apply and use
 2 = Good content, some of which I can use
 3 = Not really helpful or useful to me
 4 = Content not presented well; I didn't understand it or feel a need to learn it

Modules	1	2	3	4
Mod 1 School Library & Academic Achievement	67%	25%	8%	0
Mod 2 Info Literacy & Academic Standards	92%	8%	0	0
Mod 3 Library Collection & Flexible Access	75%	25%	0	0
Mod 4 Revitalization & Evaluation of the SLMP	67%	33%	0	0

Table 7

Module 1-4 Rating Guidelines

Knew Prior = you knew /could do this objective prior to the online course
 Didn't Know = you didn't know/couldn't have done this prior to the program.

1 = Could do this without any reference to any materials
 2 = Know the main ideas and could do this with some reference to materials received with this program
 3 = Don't remember this being included in the online program and would have to research this to do

taking the online course. For Objective 1D, only 8% (1 person) knew about the roles of library media specialists defined in national guidelines. For objective 1C, 61% of the participants rated themselves as knowing that the school library mission statement is based on the vision for the school (see Table 8).

Table 8

Module 1 Evaluation Survey Results

MOD 1 The School Library and Academic Achievement

Knew Prior	Didn't Know	Module 1 Objectives	1	2	3
38%	62%	1A. Relate recent research studies on strong school library media programs and their impact on student learning.*	8%	84%	0
38%	62%	1B. List factors of a quality school library program that correlate with increased student achievement.	15%	85%	0
62%	38%	1C. Recognize how the school library mission statement is developed based on the vision for the school.	23%	77%	0
8%	92%	1D. Describe the four roles of a school library media specialist as identified in national guidelines.	0	100%	0

Note: One person marked the line between 1 & 2 for the rating (8%)

After completing Module 1, 93% of the administrators rated themselves as being able to relate recent research studies on strong library media programs and their impact on student learning (Objective 1A) compared to only 38% who ranked themselves at the “Knew Prior” level before taking the course, an increase of 55%.

The ability to list factors of quality school library programs that correlate with increased student achievement (either with the help of some or no references) for Objective 1B was rated at 100% by the participants after taking the course compared to only 38% of them ranking themselves at the “Knew Prior” level, an increase of 62%.

Recognizing how the school library mission statement is developed based on the vision for the school for Objective 1C was rated by 62% of the participants as knowing this prior to the course, while after the course, 100% of them felt knew this information,

an increase of 38%. In the final objective 1D, 100% of the administrators thought they would be able to describe the four roles of a school library media specialist with the help of some references—up 92% from original ranking of 8% who ranked themselves in the “Knew Prior”category.

Module 2 addressed information literacy and academic standards. Objective 2A specifically addressed the definition of information literacy and the AASL (1998) nine standards. Before taking the course 15% of the participants were familiar with the standards and 15% could identify where information literacy skills fit in state academic standards (Objective 2C). Twelve of the 13 participants remembered the delivery of the content of the objective 2A from the course and 92% of them reported knowing the information related to this objective, an increase of 77%.

Sixty-nine percent of the administrators could relate the basics of an information problem-solving process (Objective 2B) prior to taking the course and after the course 92% were familiar with the material, an increase of 23% (one person did not remember this content). In relationship to Objective 2C, 15% of the administrators were familiar with the content. After completing the module, 92% of the administrators knew the information covered pertaining to collaborative planning, an increase of 77% (one person did not remember this content). Prior to the course, for Objective 2D, 62% of the 13 participants thought they could list several factors or supports necessary to facilitate collaborative planning among teachers and library media specialists. After the course, 100% of the participants rated themselves as being familiar with the material for Objective 2D, an increase of 38% (see Table 9).

Table 9

Module 2 Evaluation Survey Results

MOD 2 Information Literacy and Academic Standards

Knew Prior	Didn't Know	Module Objectives	1	2	3
15%	85%	2A. Define information literacy and give examples of several of the nine identified standards.	8%	84%	8%
69%	31%	2B. Relate the basics of an information problem-solving process.*	42%	50%	8%
15%	85%	2C. Identify where information literacy skills fit in state academic standards.	15%	77%	8%
62%	38%	2D. List several factors or supports necessary to facilitate collaborative planning among teachers and library media specialists.	62%	38%	0%

*No response from one person.

Module 3 covered information on library collection and flexible access. Objectives 3A and 3B seem to indicate a high percentage of understanding for all participants, with only 15% lacking knowledge of how a school library collection supports the school's curriculum and only 7% unable to recognize the contributions of a school library collection toward helping students establish a reading habit. For both objectives, there seems to be an increase in knowledge level of the content. For 3A it appears there is an increase of 15% and for 3B an increase of 8%. On the other hand, for objective 3C, only 15% had knowledge of inputs and some guidelines needed to develop a quality school library collection. Only 23% of participants indicated in objective 3D that they were aware of how to apply the educational research in scheduling the use of the library and its program of instructional activities prior to the course. After completing the

course, 12 of the 13 respondents indicated an increase in knowledge with 85% of the participants showing understanding related to the objectives for 3C and 69% for 3D, up 69%. One person did not remember the content covered for 3D (see Table 10).

Table 10

Module 3 Evaluation Survey Results

MOD 3 The Library Collection and Flexible Access

Knew Prior	Didn't Know	Module Objectives	1	2	3
85%	15%	3A. Understand how a school library collection supports the school's curriculum.	54%	46%	
92%	8%	3B. Recognize the contributions a school library collection can make in helping students establish a reading habit.	62%	38%	
15%	85%	3C. List the inputs and some guidelines needed to develop a quality school library collection.		100%	
23%	77%	3D. Apply the educational research in scheduling the use of the library and its program of instructional activities.	8%	84%	8%

Module 4 addressed revitalization and evaluation of the school library program. The percentage of participants rating themselves as having knowledge of Objective 4A prior to completing the course (56%) was fairly evenly split with those who indicated they did not have knowledge of the content (46%) before taking the course. In relationship to Objective 4B, 38% indicated they had prior knowledge of the content and 62% did not. For 4C, the responses of 12 of the 13 participants were evenly split with 46% indicating they had prior knowledge of the content and 46% who did not. One person marked both options. For 4D, the split was also fairly even with 46% claiming

prior knowledge and 54% indicating they did not know the content. In contrast, none of the participants rated themselves as being familiar with the content of objective 4E, how to use the AASL's School Library Media Program Assessment rubric.

After taking the course, for Objective 4A, 100% of the participants indicated they knew the material related to adequate staffing for school libraries, an increase of 46%. Twelve out of 13 respondents for Objective 4B, or 92%, seemed to be familiar with the material on the topics of recruitment, mentorship and retention, an increase of 38% (one person did not remember covering this content).

One hundred percent of participants for Objective 4C, indicated familiarity with the content related to the school library media specialist's job responsibilities and how these responsibilities differ from that of the classroom teacher as well as ways to observe and evaluate the total job performance of the library media specialist. This was up 54% from the self ratings before taking the course. After taking the course, 100% of the participants seemed familiar with ways to document instructional activities that happen in the library, up 54% for Objective 4D.

No one indicated familiarity with the content covered in Objective 4E prior to the course but after completing the course 84%, 11 of 13 participants responded that they were familiar with and knew how to use the AASL's School Library Media Program Assessment rubric, an increase of 84% (1 person of the 13 could not recall the content and another did not mark their answer) (see Table 11).

The module survey results helped establish what administrators gained from the online course and the participant interviews added an even broader perspective of the

Table 11

Module 4 Evaluation Survey Results

MOD 4 Revitalization and Evaluation of the School Library Program

Knew Prior	Didn't Know	Module Objectives	1	2	3
54%	46%	4A. Know what constitutes adequate levels of staffing in a school library.	46%	54%	
38%	62%	4B. Use various strategies to recruit, mentor, and retain a school library media specialist.	23%	69%	8%
46%*	46%*	4C. Understand how the school librarian's job responsibilities differ from that of a classroom teacher and recognize ways to observe and evaluate the total job performance of the library media specialist.	16%	84%	
46%	54%	4D. Am familiar with ways to document instructional activities that happen in the library.	8%	92%	
	100%	4E. Am familiar with and know how to use the AASL's School Library Media Program Assessment rubric.		84%**	8%**

*1 person marked both

** 8% no mark

ways that the online course was beneficial. The following are excerpts from the interviews conducted with administrators who participated in the study:

Tom Thompson indicates,

[The course] gave me a perspective I didn't have . . . it definitely increased my knowledge . . . it really brought me into the knowledge base slowly . . . which made it easier for me to comprehend and to figure out how I could use it in my building.

Vivian Henry suggests that all of the modules were informative for her,

it kind of opened up a new perspective of how a building could look and benefit kids . . . [I] enjoyed this course and it has sparked excitement and motivation to make positive changes in our media center to promote life long learners . . . a very informative opportunity.

Dan Reid addresses the opportunity for professional development as most beneficial “It’s rare that principals get to have professional development . . . we don’t get a chance to talk to one another, so [the course] afforded that opportunity, to do that.”

Leslie Ward states, as a result of the online course, she was

more aware of what a library media specialist should know and be able to do . . . I feel that I will be able to inform people now.

It just helps me to be stronger in my belief that we have to hold on to a full-time media specialist at all costs. So I would think very thoroughly if something happened in teaching that we would possibly lose a media specialist . . . I could defend that position a little more.

I feel that knowledge is power and the more people who have the ability to create the budget or the flexibility of the budget, if they are, in the realization that the library media specialist is an important part of the school, or the main hub . . . then they will realize how important it is to provide funds and flexibility for the library media specialist.

According to Mindy Johnson, the course helped her stay “ahead of the game.”

[She was] “. . . more prepared than some of [her] colleagues” due to taking the course. She wanted to implement a more flexible schedule for the library media program and she thought the course material would make it and “easier sell” . . . taking the course improved our media program . . . we are much further in planning and being more focused . . . it made me realize that it was much more of a priority than I previously thought.

Gail Anderson states,

It gave me a lot of things to think about . . . it gave me opportunities to think about how I use my library and my librarian. And it was helpful to me. I didn’t know about the literacy standards. So it did give me that information . . . it did help me sit down with her [the library media specialist] . . . and follow through with that information.

Karen Early points out that the course “reinforced and expanded” what she knew.

I am very grateful [that] the library media specialist . . . recommended I take this course . . . I now have the research to back up the ideas I am sharing with the elementary school library media specialist and staff for integrating lessons. It was very good for me.

This has been a good learning experience for me. It is reinforcing ideas I have wanted to try with faculty. The course has provided me numerous resources to validate the ideas I know I will work [on].

Alex Lake expresses thoughts similar to Carol's thoughts when he was presenting to the superintendent and the head of the language arts department.

I think it gave some justification as to where I was coming from, so it wasn't just my idea. I had some resources and some data, to support what I was saying and my suggestions and why I was leaning in certain directions. [I] was able to see the overall pictures of how our library program and our librarian can tie into all areas of our curriculum.

Jillian Loft states, "I'm more aware of the total program than I was a year ago. Much more as far as trying to get the students to read more, providing incentives and support . . . communicating that with the parents."

Emerging Themes

The process of data analysis (e.g., profiles, word walls, open axial coding and identification of semantic relationships) revealed three themes from written comments by participants on the Mansfield Course Feedback Survey and during the interviews:

(a) changed perceptions for the library media specialist and the program, (b) improved ability to communicate with the library media specialist and others, and (c) increased awareness of what the administrator can do to support the library media program. These themes indicate changed perceptions related to school library media programs by administrator participants in the study (see Appendix U).

Changed Perceptions for the Library Media Specialist and the Program

The following written comments from the administrators are summarized from course surveys, standardized responses to course survey questions and quotes from

interviews. These comments are related to what the administrators learned about the various roles the library media specialist can play in their schools.

Mindy Johnson indicates that she could see the library media specialist help make things happen.

She's actually somebody to use as a collaborator and a teacher and not just a baby sitter. The library media specialist should be a collaborator and professional development leader of the teachers . . . her job is really to help extend that knowledge to the next level. Before, I did not see the library specialist as a collaborator or a teacher leader so much . . . more of an aid to help the teachers. Because our specialist is very knowledgeable about the new technology that's out there, she's looking for new ways for the teachers to present information and the program itself has much to offer. Now, I think it's the place where teachers can go first instead of last.

She states that it was important to make the library media center more technologically advanced, making it the hub of everything that is going on in the classroom and that it is accessible and flexible, offering a lot of books and of involvement. She points out that the library media specialist has to be available and knowledgeable, with access to information.

so her role is a facilitator and an idea generator so that she can bring a fresh idea to the various meetings or different ways to think about it. She's more of an expert in flexible scheduling and information literacy . . . I expect her to have some input into the planning.

Leslie Ward describes the role of the library media specialist in the following way.

to provide the tools for teachers and students. Research tools, be available as a resource person, make sure to use the budget wisely to stay on the cutting edge of research materials and literature for the school. Also, to be that advocate for technology in the school.

She indicates that the key to a successful library media program involves,

“Communication, open communication between the administrators and library media

specialists and also media specialists with the teachers, possibly with the department head . . . I think communication is key.”

As an example of how the library media specialist makes connections to school academic goals, Leslie states, “The library media specialist is a member of the school improvement team. She’s always available there at meetings. She realizes the standard course of study that’s used in [our state] and supplements the library with those resources.” She also suggests the library media specialist should be invited to all department meetings and should serve as the “voice” for library media.

Alex Lake indicates how the course helped him realize what the library media specialist does extends beyond the walls of the library, broadening the role to working with staff and students. He also became more aware of standards and expectations for the program. He describes the major role of the library media specialist as serving students and classes and working cooperatively with teachers; a program that is realized with a person who is energetic and involved in the whole program. One of his goals was to make the library media specialist an active member of an academic department. He explains,

I was able to see the overall picture of how our library program and our librarian can tie into all areas of our curriculum and what we do, in order to help us reach our goals for our [state] . . . her [the library media specialist] goals as a professional should all tie together. Push forward. Push the program forward.

According to Vivian Henry, the course changed her expectations of the library media specialist. She sees the library media specialist as a leader in her school and that the major role is to “support teachers.” She elaborates,

we would hope that, if we were to have a full time librarian, she would be able to go beyond just checking out books and teaching [library] skills but also team teach with the teacher some of their curriculum. I think it will take some planning as an entire building, a strong team . . . and knowing our library media specialist like I do; she will be a really good leader in that. It will take time and it will take funding and it will take planning. But I think it is very realistic.

[The library media specialist] . . . needs to be innovative, willing to make changes, willing to expand, to help teachers, ultimately helping children, knowing the standards. I think the list could go on and on and on but I think that this is key to making a successful media center.

Dan Reid emphasizes the need for the library media specialist to “keep their skills constantly updated with technology” as well as being an active member of the school community, helping teachers “move the technology standards forward” and “introducing technology to teachers.”

they have to be their own cheerleader. That’s just like in any role, art teacher, music teacher; they all fit into the same thing, their own best cheerleader. If they don’t promote themselves, I think that’s when things fall to the wayside. So they really have to get it out there during staff meetings and they have to give ideas . . . promoting what they have and constantly working to improve and help teachers do a better job. Library media specialists have to be involved in many aspects of the school community, beyond the library media center. I want the librarian involved in other things other than just coming to the library and leaving at the end of the day. Be willing to go the extra mile. That personality will drive whether or not you have a library that is highly used, highly successful . . . a place where people want to be, where kids want to be, where they want to learn. Or, a place where they may feel stifled.

Dan suggests that the library media specialist can be involved by serving on committees (e.g., technology, the school decision making team, the behaviors intervention team) and by taking measures to correlate library resources to the curriculum as just a few ways to be involved in the academic program.

Karen Early indicates the online course was most beneficial in helping her understand the role of the library media specialist.

the concept of what a library media specialist should do in relation to the principal and the leadership role and then following through with interactive lessons with students rather than the traditional role of the library media specialist . . . Get involved in the research projects and the writing piece of the projects . . . the collaboration. I think it reinforced and expanded what I knew. We need to elevate, I guess, the position of the librarian to the media specialist and get her . . . into more of a team, a member of the academic faculty team. [The] library media specialist can learn more about the classroom and then tailor programs to suit their particular needs.

Karen also states,

Success is really defined by the role of the library media specialist. If we haven't done everything that we can in order to get teachers to become collaborative partners and then just use their partnership to achieve the standards then it's not successful. The fact that they're working together to come up with the choices for research, that's the success of the program. Are they using media in the library? Are they using the adult in the library to help them access information? Success [is] that they use all the materials there and they use them successfully . . . they understood the instructions and were able to follow through.

I think it has to do with personalities. That the people that are going to work together need to realize that the focus is not on their relationship as much as . . . their relationship as facilitators to the students. And that they're using each other, as two resources for information. I think that's a success. It will fail if teachers don't like what the person is saying or . . . they don't have mutual respect for their professionalism and trust that yes, this is a good idea.

According to Jillian Loft, the library media specialist plays a key leadership role in building the program, and the personality and capability of that person are central to success.

they are the ones that have the training and the expertise and, you know, if they don't advocate for what they know, [I] don't think anyone else is going to be able to. But, in general, first of all they need the training, they need the knowledge, they need the self-assurance, or the empowerment. I think they have to be well planned and organized and forthright and communicate their needs and their plans and expect that somebody will support it. I guess if they present themselves as being knowledgeable and . . . you get that from having respect, you get that from having credibility

and to me you get your credibility if people think you know what you're talking about. If you've got a plan and you are well read and continue to do professional opportunities . . . take professional development courses . . . I think it's all about credibility and enthusiasm . . . their vision, and their enthusiasm, their goal setting, their planning, ability to work with people is huge . . . if they can't work with people, you know, that's what I find one of the biggest things.

For Gail Anderson, integration of the library media program with the classroom was most important, and it was essential that the library media specialist be on board with that goal. She also suggests it is most important for the library media specialist to help teachers embrace and use technology and to make sure they have the resources they need.

Tom Thompson indicates his view of the role of the library media specialist was expanded by the course.

I thought it was a narrow job but [it's] actually a very broad job that has a lot to do with in the scope of the library. I really found that when she's teaching, there are a lot more things that need to be taught than I realized. Not only is it how to look up a book . . . it's how do I do research, how do I make books useful [to] other teachers. There's that teaching aspect with students but there's also the teaching aspect to her fellow staff members . . . I want to see more of the teacher/librarian collaborations. They need to work together so that we get the best for our kids. She needs to take an active role in teaching the standards. She will also help share/do professional development.

He also suggests it is important for the library media specialist to be involved in the technology plan and the school's Continuous Improvement Plan. He stresses that the library media specialist would have to work hard to get plans for the library off the ground.

she's got to be able to get them the information quickly and really take the driving force here to make this work. She has to have the notion that I want this to work and I want the teachers to come to me . . . If she does that, then this idea, this whole library media center will grow. But, if teachers come to her and she never gets back to them, basically it will

never get off the ground . . . continued energy from the library media specialist . . . she's got to continue to take the program forward.

Tamera Drake is “surprised to learn as much as I did about how integral [a role] Mary [the library media specialist] plays in the development of our school’s mission for our students.”

Karl Mick states, “I [have] a much better sense of the varying roles that a school library media specialist should be fulfilling . . . able to look for other than the traditional roles.”

Administrator participants used many descriptors to outline the role of the library media specialist. These descriptors are classified under the four roles of the library media specialist described in the AASL program guidelines, *Information Power* (1998), as Teacher, Instructional Partner, Information Specialist and Program Administrator (see Table 12).

The following quotes from administrators further reflect ways in which their perceptions of the library media program and the library media specialist changed after taking the course.

Mindy Johnson states that the course updated her theories on libraries and will influence how she evaluates the program and the library media specialist in the future.

The training has raised her expectations of the library media specialist.

I didn't know anything really about information literacy. I knew it was a hot topic in education but I didn't know why, so just learning the history and the basics behind it was very helpful. And, the 4th module . . . really made me evaluate my media specialist in a different way than I have my classroom teachers. The normal checklist you use for teachers doesn't apply to a media specialist. So that was helpful.

Table 12

Roles of the Library Media Specialist

Teacher*	Instructional Partner*	Informational Specialist*	Program Administrator*
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Credible • Expert • Informed • Planner • Teacher of information skills • Teacher of the research process • Teacher of teachers • Knowledgeable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborator • Involved • Team member • Integrator • Communicator • Facilitator • Leader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional developer • Technology specialist • Knowledgeable • Expert • Leader • Teacher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocate • Energizer • Leader • Innovator • Cheerleader • Facilitator • Communicator • Self-assured • Voice • Personality • Budget manager

*The roles of the library media specialist are taken from *Information Power* (AASL, 1998, pp. 4-5).

I think I view the library media program as a more essential part of the school where as before I just saw it as a tool that I could use or that the teachers could use instead of a system [where] we can work together to create a better project.

When asked if the course changed her perspective of the library media specialist, Mindy comments, “Yeah because there are a lot of goals and objectives that she [the library media specialist] needs to cover and make sure that students are aware of [and] I wasn’t fully aware of her responsibilities.”

The course also influenced her ideas about how the classroom teacher might use the library media program.

Before, I didn’t see the library specialist as a collaborator or a teacher leader so much . . . more of an aid to help the teachers. Because our specialist is very knowledgeable about the new technology that’s out there she’s looking for new ways for the teachers to present information and the

program itself has much to offer now, I think it's the place where teachers can go first instead of last.

Mindy indicates that because she knows more now, she is more on board to help make things happen.

I think that at the beginning of the year, next year, we'll have some special time for in-servicing the teachers so they can understand what that role [of the library media specialist] is and how the library should function with the information literacy piece.

Mindy is also more confident they are moving in the right direction with proposed scheduling changes for the library. After taking the course, she decided staffing the library media center with volunteers was not a good option. She also indicates the course helped her improve her knowledge of information literacy skills and how to evaluate the library media specialist. For her, what changed most was

perspective about what the library is supposed to do and how it's supposed to interact within the school. I went from seeing it as a separate piece to seeing [it] as a more interior piece . . . a piece that really needs to be utilized by all the teachers. I understand how many standards there are for information literacy to take place, I understand that there needs to be a bigger budget for the library to accomplish some of those goals and I think it's just become more of a priority for me to help that run more smoothly. [The course gave her] a more accurate picture of what I evaluate [in] both the program and the specialist.

After the course, Mindy's vision for the library media center includes making it technically advanced, making it the hub of everything that's going in the classroom, and making it accessible and flexible. She wants to eventually relocate the library media center from the basement to the center of the school. She suggests this can happen because teachers have more understanding and there is more parent involvement.

I think it's important . . . the fact that taking the course improved our media program even though we're not that far [along] . . . we [are] much further in the planning and being more focused. And I credit that to the

course. Because learning about it [the library media program] made me realize that it was much more of a priority than I previously thought.

Leslie Ward indicates that the course affirmed in many ways what she already knew and believed about the importance of the library media program. She had known someone close to her who was a library media specialist and the association had made her aware of many aspects of the program. After taking the online course, she is “now more aware of what a library media specialist should know and be able to do.” The course changed her expectations, and she now encourages more collaboration with classroom teachers and the library media specialist. The size of the library media center in her school is seen as a barrier. It is too small and she would like to remodel and enlarge it.

I feel that we are very fortunate that we are in the setting we are because we do believe that the library media specialist. . . plays a very important role and the materials that I read from the course just reiterates what [I] knew and it gave me the facts and research to show that we have to keep putting the library first, provide that funding.

As a result of the course, she comments, “I believe that library media center is a vital part of our school but I am more of a believer now. That more teachers need to take advantage of what’s being offered in the library media center.” She had only one administrative course that dealt with library media programs and that addressed budgeting “this [course] was much more beneficial. It proved to me how important [it] is to have the library media fully funded, well funded and operational in our school.” In reference to her experience with the online course, Leslie comments,

I feel that this has opened my eyes to other opportunities which are available. The online course is so beneficial for Dorothy [the library media specialist] and I to share . . . there’s just information out there that we’re just not tapping into and I would like to be able dig deeper into any kind of resources that are available, grants, or just knowledge that we’re not taking part in.

After taking the online course, Alex Lake has a different view of the library media program and he realizes the process of building a quality program has to be a team effort. He wants to form a committee to “work together on program improvements.” He suggests that the atmosphere of the library, the environment, needs to be altered. For him the course changed his perspective of the library media specialist by making him more aware of what she does to extend beyond the walls of the library and beyond the traditional task of checkout. He is now more aware of standards and expectations for the program.

Before taking the course, Alex was content if it appeared the library was getting a lot of use and the resources were current. After taking the course, he has a different perspective.

I was able to see the overall picture of how our library program and our librarian can tie into all areas of our curriculum and what we do, in order to help us reach our goals for our State Assessment tests that we take in a variety of areas: math, reading, science and soon to be, social studies. But I think just realizing how the library program fits in with all of our content areas and how it can really support what we do in the classroom. Making sure that everything is aligned in our course content and it includes the library and the library program in that alignment of our content.

Vivian Henry indicates she learned something from all four of the modules.

You know, they were all very informative to me and it kind of opened up a new perspective of how a building could look and benefit kids. [The library program] is just very limited right now and I think that it [the course] changed my thinking on how we can approach it more collaboratively, build stronger curriculum, [and] make more use of the library. There's a lot of down time in the library partly because she's a part-time tech too.

In terms of how teachers use the library, the course helped Vivian realize they needed the library media specialist to be more available,

I think we have been a little bit limited because of the availability of the library media specialist in the library. Teachers, given the opportunity to use the library at it's fullest . . . would take that in a heartbeat.

Vivian has given some thought to the scheduling of the library media center and has talked with the library media specialist about options,

having better use of the library and scheduling. Right now it's kind of scheduled on a pullout time [where] kids can come and go and check out books and . . . it would be nice to have a para-educator all day long to be supportive in other ways, more curricular kinds of things.

Through the time of taking the course I had kind of thought about several possibilities and had written one up and it's kind of exciting to know that you could actually have a lot support from staff and especially the library media specialist to do that. It's feasible to have better use of the library and scheduling.

Vivian further comments,

I think that the course really helped me see as an administrator the possibilities. Even though I was a classroom teacher for 25 years and I used the library, I guess, to the best of my knowledge. So, for me to get this [information] out for a knowledge base for teachers will help build [the library] program.

Again, has it been top of the priority list as a building? I think it's finally there. I think this program helped me get it there.

You know, I think I knew a lot of those things; it just put it into a clearer perspective. I think it goes back to what I've been saying; we need to build a stronger place so that teachers and kids do more learning in there and that the library is always busy. Right now we can go in there for a meeting here and there because it's not being used every day of the week because of the tech lab. So I think for me it was an eye opener . . . that it could serve all kids and all staff.

Being candid, Vivian states,

if someone did a study on schools and their media centers . . . we would be rated pretty low. And that makes me very sad. I think that we all know that, in this area. But until I took the course did I really see the things that could be, what we could make that into? And so, it just needs to be a focus. And, I think if we could do that as a building and share that with our other buildings in the district then hopefully they would grow too. Now I know each building is a little bit different. [The] awareness for me was wonderful and awareness now for our staff will be really important.

Dan Reid indicates how the course affected his perspective of the library media program:

I think that it just reinforced some of my thoughts, and also let me know, technology wise, where a librarian's job is really heading. When we were talking about a lot of the automation and a lot of the new types of media that they're coming out with . . . whether they need blogs or pod casts . . . we go to the library for information. Librarians now have to keep their skills constantly updated with technology because we seem to be transforming more into that area.

After hearing from others in the course, Dan appreciates how fortunate he is to have a full time library media specialist and a full time clerk at his school. When it came to scheduling of the library media program, Dan suggests he gained some new ideas through the course.

There were a lot of ideas on how to use the librarian for more than just checking out books. I am kind of stuck with a schedule . . . I have to give 40 minutes of prep time to the teachers according to the contract and [the library media specialist] is in the schedule because of that. So, she does both. She's locked into 40 minute classes but she teaches classes at that time . . . So that's what I got from this course . . . giving her the idea to sit down and meet with teachers. So she could come into their classrooms more, to see what they're doing so that she can make sure that she gets books that are updated, that really reinforces what is being taught in the classroom. . . . we do have mobile labs that she brings from the library to them. Give a demonstration to the class . . . I got that out of this class.

Dan offers that he has gained some new ideas about evaluating the library media program through the course.

I think it helped me look at a broader sense because our other evaluations . . . might make a generalized statement like does the librarian incorporate technology but, what does that mean? We have a technology plan for our school. What can the librarian do specifically, in her realm, to help meet some of those standards? You know, that might not be able to be met within the classroom, that's what we'll looking at this summer is trying to mesh those two plans together . . . So, what can the librarian do to help with that transition?

When asked about the library media program in relation to teaching and learning, Dan indicates that the course emphasized having the library media specialist knowledgeable about current curriculum, making them more connected to the classroom rather than separate. He explains,

in our old way of thinking, teachers would drop their kids at the library and it was their library time and the teachers didn't necessarily talk to the librarian, they just send [students] there . . . they get a book and they come back to class.

Karen Early's perception of the library media specialist or the program did not change significantly. She indicates that she already had similar expectations as those proposed in the course. However, she was impressed with the materials provided.

I was fascinated by the different resources that we had to read and found them to be quite interesting. All new to me . . . that is, the content of the particular materials. I am currently using some of those ideas to get our staff focused on collaboration and integrated lessons. [The materials] just broadened my whole scope of . . . we don't have to recreate. We just need to put it in place.

Jillian Loft points out the online course "heightened my awareness a lot. I think I am more aware of the total [library media] program than I was a year ago."

Gail Anderson has positive comments about the course,

At the time I did feel that the content was valuable. It gave me a lot of things to think about. I only remember that it gave me opportunities to think about how I use my library and my librarian. And that was helpful to me. I like to hear what people's ideas are. I like to use their ideas and see how I can make them my own or make them more for our building.

In terms of bringing teachers on board and working on the integration of the library, Gail state, the course

just helped me manage it differently. It helped me think about it differently . . . it validated what we do . . . I had never addressed with her [the library media specialist] any kind of standards or goals, objectives or

anything like that. I didn't know about the literacy standards. So it did give me that information. It did help me sit down with her and follow through with that information.

The course provided Tom Thompson with increased understanding.

it gave me a perspective I didn't have. She's been doing this [taking courses] for 2 ½ years . . . prior to this course she'd be talking and I would have no clue what she was talking about. So, it definitely increased my knowledge. If nothing else when she brings a proposal to me and starts whipping off words I at least know where she's coming from. Prior to this, I didn't have a clue.

Thompson describes circumstances when the library media specialist presents to all 7th grade students which he reports works very well. Even though she had started this instruction before he took the Mansfield course, he thinks the course made a difference in how he views the effort and his support for moving it forward. It helped him see the importance.

Tom describes how another opportunity arose through a grant.

We wrote a grant [for] a little over \$5,000 for the library and actually was awarded [the grant], nationally. We were excited . . . what it's going to [provide is] a wooden castle, like a reading nook . . . and it will have 2 computer stations. We'll get 2 new computers out of the grant. We [also] bought 2 new couches out of the grant, plus, I'm forgetting something else . . . oh, a couple [of] rockers . . . so that the kids will have comfortable places to read.

I found the grant. Had I not gone through this [course] I probably would have pitched it, but going through this, I read the grant and said, wow what an opportunity for the library and I passed it on and then they chose to write it and pursue it. They, the library media specialist helped the parent organization write the grant, which we ended up being awarded. So I thought that was pretty positive.

It would have been on my desk and I would have looked at it and said, neat but I don't think I would have passed it on. It was just one of those . . . because I had met with my library media specialist recently we were talking and she was telling me some of her lofty goals for up there and it came across my desk . . . I said wow, this is perfect and I took it to her. I'm sure if I hadn't taken the class . . . we wouldn't have had the opportunity to sit down and discuss some of her goals for the program.

Tom continues,

I need to get my staff to understand that the library has more resources for them than just books. She [the library media specialist] can bring a different focus to the indicators, a new way of teaching. And I didn't see that before. I wouldn't have thought of going to her and saying, "Hey, I need to teach this indicator . . . what are some ideas?" Now I would see it as a natural link.

The course helped him see the importance of evaluating the library media program.

I would have never thought about evaluating the program. I am so into evaluating the teacher and looking at achievement scores that it just gave me a different perspective that, yeah, you know, the media specialist can be doing a heck of a job but if the program itself is not right, we're not gaining as well as we could.

In her comments on the feedback sheet, Tamera Drake writes,

as an administrator and someone who works closely with our site librarian, it surprised me to learn as much as I did about how integral a role Mary [the library media specialist] plays in the development of our school's mission for our students. I really feel that this Module [#2] is important because it focuses on collaboration and the importance of scheduling. Time MUST be built into teachers' schedules to accommodate this need.

Improved Communication

Another theme that emerged from the course was the administrators' improved ability to communicate with the library media specialist and others, and a heightened awareness of the importance of that communication. The following quotes reflect the ways the administrators have changed their approach to communication about the library media program and how they better understand the exchanges they have with their library media specialists.

Alex Lake suggests it was important to communicate with the library media specialist as he formulated the action plan for the course.

I was going to [the library media specialist] and asking her questions based on my interest and this allowed her to say, “Well if he’s interested and he’s asking then he really wants to know.” Then he would be very open with her suggestions. So I think it opened a rapport between us. And it showed, hey, he has some general interest in the library program and he wants to move it in a certain direction and that gave her encouragement.

So as I was going through this program and writing up that action plan, of course it made no sense for me to describe it . . . because I would be expecting our librarian to implement some of those things that I wrote down, or at least that was my hope. So, I would go back and forth and speak with her and explain to her about the Mansfield program, saying this is what I’m doing . . . I might as well use this time effectively . . . what changes would you like to make? What switches would you like to see happen?

When working on plans for the library media program, Vivian Henry indicate the importance of communication.

Well I think that the first step that I would need to do is talk to our library media specialist, and I have, like I said, have done that with her early on, when I was involved in the course itself. To share some of those things [and] get the staff excited . . . start making those plans that are feasible with [the] levy that we got this year and start moving forward.

Communication with the library media specialist was important to Dan Reid.

While developing the action plan for the course, he talked with the library media specialist.

I spent the time with my librarian to tell her, talk to her about what she thought it should look like and what I thought it should look like and this is what I want to see as a finished product. So that she’s aware [of] my thoughts . . . so she’s no just guessing or just under the impression that I just don’t care because I’m not talking to her about what things I would like to see in place . . . she’s motivated by that . . . she’ll say I want to get that done because it’s important to me.

Karen Early indicates that the training made her realize the importance of meeting with the library media specialist on a regular basis.

[The course] motivated me to make sure we meet regularly and I help implement the ideas as outlined in the program. I need to make time to help her become the leader she can be as [a] library media specialist.

. . . we met prior to the school year and I laid out some ideas and some strategies for her to get involved and take over some instructional pieces with the faculty. I gave her the literature that we had, the various books [from the online course]. I shared that with her, the superintendent, the assistant superintendent and she took on the challenge. She took the initiative to contact faculty about developing units with them.

Karen also used the information to raise the awareness of the library media specialist as she created lesson plans with teachers. Karen describes the following exchange,

when Rande [the library media specialist] was submitting her lesson plans I noticed they were really missing references to standards. I wasn't seeing a relationship between what she was teaching and what we were expected to do as far as our meeting standards in our content areas.

I met with her . . . and the head of the library department and prior to that I had talked to the other . . . elementary principals and said how are you handling this? What does your library media specialist do? What kind of lesson plans are they providing for you?

So they gave me samples of what their various library media specialists were doing in other grade levels and building. So, I compared those and when I got together with Rande I said, and the head librarian, and the assistant superintendent worked with me and we said, OK, if you understand about lesson plans you'll know why I am questioning this and she was, at first a little defensive thinking she was getting reprimanded and I said, no, no, no, you have to be able to walk the walk with the grade level teachers who are expected to meet [state] standards and assessment because everything they do has to be related to this.

So . . . after we met, I pointed out, here's what is expected at this level . . . you know, there's a research component to every grade level that needs to be reflected in your lesson plans. The more you think about it, the more you'll understand when you're helping and doing collaboration, you'll be able to have meaningful discussions with the grade level teachers because they're thinking in terms of how this is going to meet standards.

. . . many months later she comes in, she thanks me for heightening her awareness . . . putting her into a situation where she could speak knowledgeably with the other teachers, therefore, their trust in her, understanding.

When asked if she thought taking the Mansfield course was beneficial to her as a principal, Jillian Loft's responds, "Yes I do and I felt that . . . I think the librarian and I worked better together because of it."

any time Ellie [the library media specialist] comes to me, "Jillian, I have an idea. Jillian, I want to do this. I want to do that." I've never told her no. Never. I have so much respect and faith in what she does . . . especially after this program, I just encourage any effort that she has, or any effort that she makes in making her library better . . . more pleasant . . . you know, I would definitely carry this over.

For Gail Anderson, the course resulted in improved meetings and discussions with her library media specialist about information literacy.

my weekly meetings with my librarian will have more focus. . . . I think that Karin [the library media specialist] and I sat down and talked a lot more about what it could look like and what . . . the work that she does.

[I had] never addressed with her any kind of standards or goals, objectives or anything like that. I didn't know about the literacy standards. So it did give me that information. It did help me sit down with her, you know, and follow through with that information.

The information acquired from the course helped Tom Thompson better understand his library media specialist.

prior to this course . . . she'd be talking and I would have no clue what she was talking about. If nothing else when she brings a proposal to me and starts whipping off words I at least know where she's coming from.

Because of taking the course and because he is now the principal administrator, Tom feels that communication with the library media specialist has improved, "I've done more meetings because of becoming principal but also because of the knowledge of the course so that when we talk I'm not out in left field . . . I have a clue what she's talking about."

Karl Mick wrote on his course feedback form,

I will work with our SLMS [school library media specialist] to encourage the roles that appear deficient.

Being in regular communication with the school library media specialist so that I begin to see her as a support to regular Ed . . . make integration projects a regular part of faculty meeting . . . sharing time.

Another theme related to communication was the ability on the part of the administrators to better inform others about school libraries, the role of the library media specialist and the importance or the direction of the library media program. This is reflected in the following excerpts from course evaluation comments and from interviews.

Mindy Johnson comments that she wanted to open the library schedule to be more flexible, but teachers were accustomed to a set library time that provided them with 30 minutes of planning time without students. She suggests that information from the course made it “an easier sell” because she and the library media specialist had reliable facts and reasons for their desire to change the approach to scheduling in a way that was beneficial for both teachers and students.

Leslie Ward indicates that the course gave her valuable resources that she can use to communicate with others.

I feel that I will be able to inform people now. I serve on several curriculum councils for our county and our region and I believe I can be a voice for that.

I believe that library media center is a vital part of our school but I am more of a believer now.

According to Leslie, the key to a successful media program involves

Communication, open communication between the administrators and library media specialists and also media specialists with the teachers, [and] possibly with the department head. Allow the department to be knowledgeable about what’s available for their subjects. I think communication is a key.

Alex Lake comments that he had shared information learned in the course with the superintendent of schools and the head of the language arts department. When asked if he thought it was beneficial to share the information, he states,

Most definitely, because I think it gave some justification as to where I was coming from, so it wasn't just my idea. I had some resources and some data, to support what I was saying and my suggestions and why I was leaning in certain directions. It just supported me, rather than just coming off as a whim.

Alex also identifies a need for a written job description for the library media specialist and he saw it as a two-sided issue.

My only hesitation with writing it, a very detailed job description would be that I don't want it to be limiting . . . as employees change, as time changes, that's a concern as an administrator. I don't want to limit myself either, so . . . that job description I would write in broad terms, in general terms. I really wouldn't get that specific.

Discussing the pluses of having a job description, Alex states that it would raise awareness about the role and responsibilities of the library media specialist as another form of communication.

It lets the librarian know and the other staff members know just how much is involved in the position. It gives a lot of credibility to the position where . . . I'm not saying that's the attitude of the staff but . . . what do they do? They check books out; they turn on the computers for us when we come in. They know where to look to find certain things. Looking at the librarian's job in that respect is pretty simplistic. But I think, once, you know, having something in an outline form gives a lot of credibility to our librarian too because our staff gets to sit back and say, wow, there's an awful lot of responsibility. There's a lot of work to be done, that they don't see on the surface.

Vivian Henry appreciates the knowledge about resources she gained through the online course. She found them useful in her communication with others.

There were a lot of resources and, in fact, I shared several of those with our library media specialist . . . as well with other teachers in our building so I think that was a huge benefit . . .

So, for me to get this [information] out for a knowledge base for teachers will help build [the library] program.

Vivian describes informing classroom teachers about a goal for technology and literature links.

I started last fall when I was involved in the course, talking to the library media specialist, and then as things progressed early in the fall, third grade [teachers] wanted to work on the goals together. [The library media specialist] and I encouraged some of the literacy kinds of things and it just blossomed from there. Our media specialist played a huge piece in that.

Dan Reid indicates on his Module 1 Evaluation form that the course “forced him to do more of the research . . . with [his] current library media center to show the community how important it is to continue [the] current level of service.” He also shared the course content with others in his district, including other administrators.

I shared with the principals. I work with two other principals here. When I was taking the course, I talked to them about other schools and where they were at, the problems that had occurred. I also spoke with board members thanked them for their support of the library. I think we have a good regional system down here too.

Just keeping your board members apprised of what’s going on in the library. What’s being updated, what’s needed and how it can be of benefit to the education of the children, I think helps.

A regional Librarian can be a real cheerleader for the libraries and they bring other districts in and other principals and let them know how important it is to have a full operational, functional library and what it takes to maintain one.

Dan used the library media center to showcase new technology acquired for the building. This had been a controversial decision since other administrators argued he should have put this technology resource in the classroom. He explains that ultimately he plans to put it in the classroom, but the first one is being placed in the library media

center. He sees the library media specialist as key to introducing the technology to teachers. And he suggests his strategy would pay off.

after this summer . . . [the library media center] will be a training center before school, after school. She uses [a smart cart] . . . often with the kids to show them how to look up things online because there's a big screen. . . . She's doing some on-line books which are interactive books which is another tool that we bought . . . That's why I put it in the library . . . if you want that to be your focal point, for training . . . then that's where you would have it.

Dan indicates it is important for the library media specialist to be involved directly in communication, in many different ways. He stresses how essential it is for the library media specialist to be engaged in many aspects of the school community beyond the library media center. He lists the many committees his library media specialist is involved in and he suggests,

As long as that person [the library media specialist] is out there promoting what they have and constantly working to improve and help teachers do a better job and the teachers are aware of that—wow she's willing to help me with my math curriculum because I'm having problems with a couple of kids and she's willing to help me with these couple kids to find resources to help them—they're going to utilize her more. They talk it up. They talk up with the board members and in small communities, if everybody had that belief—that it's important—the library will be sustained as it is.

We talk about where kids are getting in trouble . . . she's involved in that aspect and she kind of gives me a sense of the pulse of the school . . . Maybe the 3rd grade teachers are upset because the kids are getting out of hand in the bathrooms and so that's what we talk about once a month . . . what can we do.

We thought a certain grade level was picking on kids with disabilities more . . . we did a school wide thing but then we did a school level thing where we talked about tolerance. And she was part of that kind of stuff and finding media along with that, whether it be something for the teachers, giving them resources, quick clips that they can show in their classrooms. She would email . . . that information. So, it's just good to have her as part of that . . . she's been on the [decision making team], she's been on the [behaviors intervention] team. She's always involved in things. I guess that's the expectation too that I want the librarian involved

in other things other than just coming to the library and leaving at the end of the day.

Karen Early describes the ways she used the course information when communicating with various groups.

I sat down with my superintendent and assistant superintendent and discussed the possibilities of making sure that our librarian was elevated to a library media specialist.

I had at the faculty meeting . . . pointed out how I thought we could . . . collaborate and that the library media specialist would be contacting them for specific dates when they could get together.

Karen has gone to additional effort to act on the plans for the library media center by arranging a meeting with the superintendent, assistant superintendent and the district library media specialists to discuss building assignments for the next school year. When they know how library media specialists will be assigned to buildings, her hope is that the building administrators can then discuss expectations. When asked what she hoped to gain from the meeting, she explains,

hoping that one of them brings to light the fact that she's had more collaboration and that will develop a little question and answer for the other library media specialist on how that took place. Hopefully that will facilitate some more discussion about how they see themselves and how they can get more involved with the classroom teacher.

So hopefully . . . adjusting schedules to accommodate more time for [the] library media specialist. So that will be an important piece . . . also the role that we as principals can take to unify the expectations in our district of library media specialists.

Gail Anderson used the action plan she designed as part of the online course to communicate expectations with the teachers in her building regarding their work with the library media specialist "I have made the requirement that every teacher in grades 2, 4, and 5 have to do at least two collaborative technological projects with the librarian. So they know they have to do them."

Tom Thompson used staff meetings as a way for the library media specialist and him to present plans to the teaching staff.

. . . [at] our first staff meeting both of us kind of brought this up. She did a little segment, I did a little segment—presenting to my staff about the benefits of the library and that she is more than a librarian that [she] can help with indicators, can help look up books, resources, to better enhance teaching. We kind of really stressed that this year in our first meeting.

We've done . . . some journal articles that we found, that we copied for the staff, we've discussed those. One of our meetings, we're hoping to take a journal article or a more of a professional style book and read that and discuss with the staff and again try to get them to understand the connection between the standards, libraries and what the research out there is telling us. So that's kind of a different component of it also. The library media specialist took time to highlight important points [from the articles] and share them with the staff.

Tom thought it would be helpful to share what he had done with the library media program as well as the information gained from the online course with others. He states,

[The] superintendent is extremely impressed with what Paula [the library media specialist] is doing in the program. He's impressed that the high school librarians are meeting. So some good [bridges] are being built right now. What I need to do is use those to help me out and it's a slow process. He's aware of my needs but he's also aware of the budget . . . it's one of those [things] where you walk a very fine line and try to work out the deals. But I am trying to get him involved. I need to do more of that next year . . . I've got to get him to buy into the program fully.

Awareness of Administrator's Role

Participants in the study made references to how they perceive their role as administrators in providing support for the library media specialist and the program. They also commented on how they can actively promote the library media program to others, such as teachers, other administrators, school board members, parents and community members. The following quotes reflect their perspectives.

In terms of her role as the administrator and the impact of her opinions, Mindy Johnson comments,

I think if I can supply administrative support, the teachers aren't going to think that it's some sort of theory that's been handed down as another thing they have to do. I can show them that I really am behind the idea. They're going to appreciate that and feel free to come to me with ideas or problems or situations that need to be addressed. If they know that I listen and stand behind this process then it runs more smoothly. So I have to not only be there with the budget but with my time and availability. I think I have a lot of impact. I think if the teachers see this isn't just an idea that the media specialist came up with . . . another buzz word in education that's going to go away in a while . . . I think that they're going to be more willing and excited about the project. So I think on a scale of 1 to 10, I think my support will be a 9 to be successful.

The most important thing that I can do is to know that it is a priority. The second thing would be to make it happen, make it a reality. A lot of times it's budget and support.

When asked how much impact her opinions hold in implementing plans for the library media program, Leslie Ward indicates they are substantial.

I think that I probably have a lot of influence. I am hoping to have more. Some of my duties are shifting. I have been busy with other job duties. But hopefully with my new job's duties I can spend more time on curriculum and part of the curriculum will be enhancement for the media center.

I have a close relationship with the curriculum council of our county and our region. Also, just trying to have a close relationship with the teachers here. If they will be so willing, as I mentioned earlier, these teachers are pretty content so if we can see ways for improvement that will involve their students . . . I think that they will be ready to move to learn from that.

I feel that I can just support the media specialist and make sure that she has the communication with the teachers and the time and the resources needed to do so.

More teachers need to take advantage of what's being offered in the library media center. I would like to see maybe a review of the checkout and a review the schedule to see which teachers are being part of the media center and which are not taking part in that and being an advocate for the media center, show what is available. I would like to be better at that if there were time . . . that's what I've learned, to be more of an advocate for the library.

As an administrator, Alex Lake indicates he should encourage the staff and establish expectations for them to use the library media center and the library media specialist. In terms of his role, he states,

I think the course allowed me to be the catalyst. It pushed me in that direction rather than vice versa.

[To provide] . . . an awful lot of support. I have an enthusiastic librarian and she dives into everything that she does here and she assists us with many things beyond just being our high school librarian. She assists with the gifted program and assists in the after school tutoring program. So, I think, one, is support and two, is using the administrative pull to make sure that if it's improvement, if it's a budget item, if it's something that's deemed important by the committee and it comes my way, that I go the next step and show my support, whether it be to the business manager or superintendent, saying, hey, this is something that we really feel is important, this is a direction that we need to move in. And just that overall leadership, that example to the rest of the staff draws attention to, hey this is that's deemed important, the library and its function and its structure is seen as being important in our school.

If your administration is supporting a program, or is pushing a certain direction, I think then the staff believes that's an expectation put upon them. I think that's true in anything . . . So yeah, I think the administration and the principal of the building have a lot of influence over programs just based on their support and enthusiasm toward them.

When asked to consider her role as an administrator trying to improve the library media program, Vivian Henry comments on the impact her opinions hold for her staff.

I think a great deal. I collaborate with the teachers. I've gathered information all year long about goals that we want to at least show some progress on next year and . . . I have been for some time. I guess I'm instructional leader and that's my role.

I think [my statements] will help with direction and hopefully will inspire people to pursue other directions . . . I am open to change and improvement and to build that as a team so that there's buy-in by all teachers too.

When asked how he can keep the goals of the library media program moving forward, Dan Reid notes he can do this

as a supervisor asking her periodically . . . where are you at . . . what are you doing in your program to enhance it or what are you doing with another teacher? She's constantly done that.

I think the principal's job is to make sure that librarian is doing those kinds of things and wanting to do those kinds of things otherwise you have a big problem.

As an administrator Dan Reid indicates his influence on others in terms of the library media program.

I think the administrator has a great amount of influence. We're the ones that control the amount of money that we recommend to the board for the library to get. If a principal comes in and says, look, we're not going to give any money to the library this year because we need to money to hire another teacher, for example, that decision could be bad—but you have to weigh those things out. So, I think it is a huge impact.

You could be making decisions that will impact your library in a number of ways whether it be buying more resources or in having the numbers in staffing. I have two [people] in there. I could go down to one . . . or maybe none. I've heard of schools that had a library but there's no librarian. I don't know how schools do that.

Dan's comments indicate a theme related to the importance of communication.

We have to be good politicians. So if we keep doing that. We keep getting out to the public how important it is, then it's going to be important to the board members to approve and be on your side regarding funds expended in the library . . . and the community is going to votes yes on the budget because they believe it's important as well. I mean its one line-item out of many line-items that we'll get yes or no on, but it is important to get it out there . . . to say, this is what we're hoping, to expand our library media services.

Karen Early indicates her role with regard to the library media specialist when she states, "I need to make time to help her become the leader she can be as [a] library media specialist." She suggests she plays a dual role in the implementation of the action plan. She wants a relationship to develop between the library media specialist and the teachers. So, first she has to promote the ideas to the library media specialist and help define her

role, and second, with the classroom teachers, she has to emphasize their responsibilities. In Karen's words, she "was part of that role definition and clarification stage."

Jillian Loft comments on using the materials from the course and following up on the action plan

I think it definitely helped me be more aware of [the] role that I could play in helping to get things accomplished faster. You know, I saw the purpose, the relevance, the importance . . . I mean I saw it before . . . I think something like this makes you more aware. It brings it to the front. You know, a lot faster.

When asked how much impact her opinions have on teachers and the library media specialist in implementing the plan for the library media program, Gail Anderson responds,

A lot of impact. I mean, because I'm telling them what they have to do . . . and when you tell somebody what they have to do . . . I have an impact of putting into their expectations. Now, the librarian has the impact of making it be good enough for them to see value in it and to want to go back and do it again. So, you know, she and I have to work collaboratively on this to make sure that teachers see the value added. They have a lot to do. We have high, high expectations in this district. So I have to make them see that this is really something worthwhile.

I just want to make sure that everybody does . . . the two projects that I expect. Right now, that's what I expect in the course of the next year. I ask to see the results.

Tom Thompson indicates it was important for him to facilitate connections between the library media program and the school improvement plan. He states,

next year when I look at my building CIP my goal is to figure out how to tie use of the library into some of these building goals. Because I think that it can, it's another tool I can use to reach these goals in this plan.

When asked how much impact he thinks his opinions have on teachers or the library media specialist in the accomplishment of the action plan, he replies,

I think it's a lot because right now . . . the librarian was excited that I was going to buy into it. So she's been able to use that as a motivator for some of the ideas, selling this idea of the study sessions, you know, the principal is behind it. He thinks it's a benefit to our building. He thinks it's a benefit to our kids. She's able to use me to convince the staff that it's a good thing. It's been a real positive for us. Because if I had been given a negative attitude, like "yeah go do it but I don't want anything to do with it"--that's what the staff is going to pick up on. Instead they're seeing me as a central focus and I'm going to be part of the study sessions. I'm going to be involved and, therefore, the staff wants to buy into [it] too.

Tom views his opinions as helpful in advancing the plan for the library media program because it helps to have administrative backing. It shows connections to the goals for the building-- what is planned and the intent of those plans. He sees his primary role as,

Resource finder, if there [are] ideas that either the librarian or the teachers have, I need to figure out how . . . [if they] need a class set of this book to make it work or we need more of a professional development journal. I need to figure out how to fund those. So I'm kind of . . . trying to get this material they need to make this whole thing work. To better their scores and their content standards in the classroom and better improvement of the library in the long run.

In her comments on the course evaluation form, Tamera Drake states she wants to "Assign more staff to the library so that a proper assessment could be conducted and the collection increased in the necessary areas."

Action Planning

Part of the expectations of the online course was that each administrator would use the document, "A 13 Point Library/Media Program Checklist for Building Administrators," to examine the needs of their library media program and rate aspects of the program as outlined on the checklist (see Appendix E). In relationship to each item on

the checklist, administrators were to rate their programs using a Likert scale with the following ratings:

- 3 = Doing great
- 2 = Making progress
- 1 = Needs work

After the ratings were complete, they were to go through and pick the top seven areas on the checklist that needed improvement and write one or more objectives that could be realistically accomplished to improve each area of weakness. The following 13 program themes constituted the checklist:

- Professional staff and duties
- Professional support
- Collection size and development
- Facilities
- Curriculum and integration
- Resource-based teaching
- Information technology
- Telecommunications
- Networking & interlibrary loan
- Yearly goal planning
- Budget
- Policies/communications
- Evaluation

Each administrator who participated in the study completed an action plan. At the time of the interviews, the 2006 participants had worked on their plans for an entire school year, while the 2007 participants had worked on their plans for part of a school year. The action plans provided a structure for administrators with support to go through the process of identifying efforts made to improve the library media program. Themes of action emerged from their comments during the interviews (e.g., purchasing acquisitions,

making links to information literacy and curriculum, providing time for planning or staff development, redesigning schedules, etc.) (see Appendix V).

The following comments illustrate what each administrator learned from the process of creating an action plan and what they accomplished in the plan for their library media programs. The interviews provided an opportunity for the administrators to reflect on the meaning of their experience in taking the online course and in implementing their action plans.

Jillian Loft set a goal in her action plan to rewrite the evaluation for the library media specialist but then decided she could use the current teacher evaluation as long as she focused it in a different way.

[The library media specialist] is part of the teacher evaluation . . . this year, I evaluated her a little different than the teachers . . . I do watch a lesson of hers when she teaches but I also evaluate her on other aspects of her program. [For example,] how she works with us with our incentives . . . she worked a lot with us on the reading grant, the booktalks . . . I took into consideration all of those other things that she does . . . understanding that maybe some things aren't real pertinent. Communication with parents . . . she writes a monthly newsletter article but she may not do it like a classroom teacher would . . . So, I think the instrument we use is fine it's just, I have to try to be specific to her.

The purchase of science resources such as books and videos for the library were made to match the action plan Jillian developed. Beyond that, the emphasis on the action plan played out in informal ways like stressing the need for teachers to connect with the library media specialist and for the library media specialist to provide avenues for teachers to work with her. Teachers were positive about the focus of the action plan.

Jillian comments,

[Teachers] appreciated the fact that if they needed something they could go to Ellie with [sic] she would work with them. She'd get right in the

trenches with them and work with them and then if they needed something they wanted ordered or suggestions or websites or things they could do with the students . . . so I think they really appreciated that.

When asked what insights she gained from the course, Jillian stressed the need for a full time library media specialist and a larger center.

I wish there was some way to get school systems or help school systems not only understand the importance of [the library media specialist] but help them fund a person for each building. I just wish we could have [the library media specialist] all the time and I know we can't and I know we're lucky to have her two days a week . . . [I] just think that if every school system, every school building should have a media person, it would . . . make a huge impact.

I would like to have a bigger facility and I'd like to have Ellie more. I mean I would like to have all updated holdings nothing older than five years. I would like to have the library be a more fun place; we're working on that too as far as graphics, a fun inviting place. I think the environment, I'd like to have [it be] more pleasant and have Ellie longer and have more money for the budget.

She continued commenting on the action plan, "I feel really good about it. I feel like any time we can strengthen that program . . . it doesn't benefit one or two people, it benefits the students, the teachers, the community overall."

In Gail Anderson's action plan, one objective was aligning curriculum content in different subject areas to AASL Information Literacy Standards. She shared the plan with her library media specialist who correlated the information literacy standards to the language arts standards of their state. They found that most of the language was embedded, so they could use the language as it already existed. According to Gail, this started a conversation about standards.

[I had] never addressed with her any kind of standards or goals, objectives or anything like that. I didn't know about the literacy standards. So it [the course] did give me that information. It did help me sit down with her, you know, and follow through with that information.

Another outcome of the action plan was that Gail made requirements of teachers and provided a role for the library media specialist in teacher planning.

I have made the requirement that every teacher in grades 2, 4, and 5 have to do at least two collaborative technological projects with the librarian. So they know they have to do them. And basically teachers, a majority of my teachers are agreeable.

We do have grade level planning meetings that I did [include] the librarian [in] . . . once a month. So that was something that we did put into play.

Gail also placed the library media specialist on the School Improvement Planning team so that she could add another perspective and contribute to defining the school goals. She points out what was put in place related to the action plan.

I think that [the library media specialist] and I sat down and talked a lot more about what it could look like and what . . . the work that she does. So I think that if I've done anything, I have taken the work that she does and I have made it more specific toward that action plan.

To continue the action plan, Gail sees the following as a goal,

My vision is to have teachers working in there collaboratively with the librarian on research projects, on projects that help children using the Big6™, learning how to do the research, learning what a good website is, learning all those things that we are hoping to teach them through our library program, through the curriculum. To make sure these kids know how to do the research.

I want her to be teaching them more than anything. And that's what she is teaching along with studying some really good research projects. She's doing a great job of that.

I just think it's going to take patience and I don't see any reason why it won't get there. I absolutely believe I'll be there.

Tom Thompson's action plan focused on curriculum integration and collaboration and involved presentations to the teaching staff on those topics.

some journal articles that we found, that we copied for the staff, we've discussed those. One of our meetings, we're hoping to take a journal article or more of a professional style book and read that and discuss with the staff and again try to get them to understand the connection between

the standards, libraries and what the research out there is telling us. So that's kind of a different component of it also. The library media specialist took time to highlight important points [from the articles] and share them with the staff.

Tom has a part-time library media specialist in his building and he addresses that challenge in relationship to his action plan.

To best accomplish it is to make sure I give time, and this is difficult for my building . . . time for the library media specialist to actually meet with the teachers. As [I said,] she's tied to the elementary [school] and their classes. I have no control over that aspect. So . . . the little free time she has left, she needs to be in the library working with kids. I've got to figure out, how do I get her time to meet with my teachers. Teachers are overworked. I've got to figure out how to set aside enough time during the day to give it enough time to work and that's going to be the hurdle for me to overcome because I really want this to work.

Karen Early implemented an in-service, "The Vision for the Future," as part of her action plan and presented it at the beginning of the school year.

One of the key messages I wanted to get across, and I did, and that is using the librarian for integrating lesson plans, having them help do research, having [the] librarian help line up media, make sure that the benchmarks of standards were met. . . . All those seeds were planted at that time and grade levels were able to utilize those ideas throughout the school year, so that was successful.

Another goal for the library media program was sharing research on collaboration. Karen did this by creating booklets and posting them on the school Web site. The research on collaboration included topics such as sustained silent reading and inclusion. She suggests the information on inclusion applied to the library media specialist because it dealt a lot with the subject of collaboration. She explained that it identified concepts of team teaching, co-teaching and various types of professionals working together.

Karen also wanted to create times when teachers could work with the library media specialist.

I had at the faculty meeting . . . pointed out how I thought we could . . . collaborate and that the library media specialist would be contacting them for specific dates when they could get together. Basically here's what we want to do with the time. Arrange the time to meet with her. Tell her your ideas. Let her share what she can do for you.

So she met at these 15 minute times, got an idea of what they wanted and then she went back and researched all the things she could offer and sent it back to them. So, . . . they just got a back and forth thing going.

Karen required the teachers to include in the lesson plans they turned into her each week how they used the library media center and how they worked with the library media specialist. This was her way of knowing what was being accomplished related to her goals for the library media program and the action plan.

it was a real good opportunity for me to lay some groundwork for the library media specialist because it was something that hadn't been done before. I was new to the building so I thought, OK, with all this newness, let's make some changes, let's see how constructive they can be.

The classroom teacher should never feel like they have to present material that they may not be as familiar with . . . that there's somebody else that could develop that picture differently. That it is great to use the information by one person, the classroom teacher, but . . . it's nice when more than one teacher can give out information and in more than one way. So, it kind of spreads out that trust in the students . . . it's not just the classroom teacher, it's what the school has to offer, it's what education programs tend to offer and that second individual does that . . . opens that door.

And that really came from working with a very capable and professional library media specialist and the literature I got through the course. I really thought that the literature was wonderful.

Mindy Johnson gradually implemented her action plan by getting teachers to buy into the schedule and emphasizing change in the library media center. She and the library media specialist started by presenting the intended changes at staff meetings. In the beginning teachers were most concerned about losing their planning periods and the new expectations of scheduling library time. Once it was explained, many teachers started

working with the new schedule and were also asked for feedback, telling what they liked about flexible scheduling.

I heard good comments, how they feel more involved with the students' projects. How they feel they're being able to use the library more efficiently because of what they know and they like the fact that they can get in large blocks of time. [Instead of] waiting for their library day once a week, they can schedule library three or four days in a row if they need it.

Mindy stresses the importance of making the goals for the library media program a priority by providing a budget and other support. She suggested they were further along than they would have been without the course; it helped them to be more focused and to do more planning.

Commenting on the process of action planning, Leslie Ward states,

I do not think that they are brand new areas of focus. I think. . . they are areas . . . to concentrate more on these areas this year and because we've gone through the 13 point checklist we now have documentation on what we really need to work on . . . and these were seven that need work. Even [though] they have been looked at in the past, I think we can concentrate on these seven points now.

Leslie notes that her school needs to update its technology and the use of that technology.

I feel that we have a very hard working media specialist but our technology needs to be updated. I think she's very willing to get the skills of this technology but we don't have the funds and the resources. I just feel that we do not have the technology and the resources and the education to use that technology. That's our downfall.

Once we learn some strategies, we want to make sure that our students are allowed to participate. For one thing, I believe our students should have access to the media center after hours. We're going to try to work more toward that.

Leslie's action plan emphasized curriculum integration and collection development related to the review cycle. Leslie indicates the course helped her prove it was necessary. She makes the following observations in relationship to the library media program.

I will be working more with the library and making sure that all courses of study [are] up-to-date and the media specialist works more with each department head to make sure that we have all the curriculum needs available. We will look at our goal summary sheets and see how much of that test, what percentage of that test is focusing on the different subject areas and we're going to divide up our instructional time so that it correlates with what needs to be taught, how much needs to be taught.

After that curriculum mapping is completed we will ensure that every topic is being focused on in the course text [and that] there are materials available for that.

An evaluation component for the library was also part of Leslie's action plan. It was something to be addressed in the workshops planned for the next school year. "Well I believe when we have the evaluation component we can see our downfalls and our successes and we can learn what needs to be done from that." In terms of expectations for teachers in her building in response to the plan, Leslie hopes they will contribute through monthly meetings of the School Improvement Planning Committee. The library media specialist also serves on that committee.

I feel that teachers need to have ownership and I would like to see a media committee, separate from the school improvement committee, on how the media can be improved. . . they could look at other schools or search other ways of improvement and present it to the school improvement team which would in turn make those objectives.

Dorothy [the library media specialist] would be a member of both teams. She is a member of the school improvement team and the media enhancement committee and she is a vital role player in that committee because she is a voice for the media. She can share with us the budget and how that's being used and she can also share with us some of her visions she has for the future.

Another goal identified by Leslie was to have the library media center play an instrumental role in a senior research project that is required for graduation. She wants to use this as a tool for communicating the importance of the library to the community.

I would like the community to take a more vital role in the library media program. I would like for them to be aware of what is offered for students

and for them to just come in . . . stakeholders of our school. I feel that if the library could be open possibly have extended hours . . . Open hours and advertising. I would like for the community . . . we need the community's involvement. We're going to begin a senior project, that's going to be one of my duties that one of the job duties that is changing. We're going to call on the community. We're going to have open house here, were going to have town center meetings, we're going to broadcast on air with our schools we're also going to have a billboard that's going to explain the senior projects. We're putting some articles in the newspaper and in doing so we may invite the students, the public to say, these are our resources that are available, can you help us expand on these? How can we improve this because it's going to take the media center as one of the key players in this senior project.

Alex Lake was very creative in developing the goals for his action plan. He did not try to stick to the goals literally but identified areas that fit the needs of the library media program and would take it in new directions. He wanted to make the library media specialist an active member of an academic department. Alex saw it as a way to help the library media specialist develop curriculum based in the library. He suggests he would like to

expand upon what we do in terms of research education for our students and what it is that our teachers really expect them to be able to do on their own. And then visa versa the librarian communicating to our teachers . . . this is what she's teaching in her classes when she interacts with the students. This is what the students should be able to do on their own and be able to research and text selection in the library without any assistance. So that everybody is on the same page . . . they realize when I take a group into the library, this is what I will expect of a students, of the librarian and of them also.

He also wants a library committee that would include the library media specialist, himself, the guidance counselor and two of the language arts department members.

forming a committee that meets and discusses solely the operation structure of the library will help with that. They'll keep us on task. It's easy to say OK we'll make improvements and sometime they get done and sometimes they don't get finished so sometimes you narrow your focus and when you start out with great intentions and then you look back and

say, boy we really didn't stick to task on that. I think the committee will play a large part in making sure that we stay on task, focusing on this whatever purpose we want . . . in that area.

Alex notes it is important to plan yearly goals that tie into the action plan. In his plan, he had a list of goals for the program and a checklist for improvements. A timeline and budget considerations are also important. This tied into another area of focus, improving the "look" of the center. Alex explains how this will be undertaken.

Our building is nearing 40 years old and some furniture and fixtures in our library are . . . have been here since the building opened.

Appearance is a real big, big issue for me. I would like improvements cosmetically and then also systematically in terms of what is it that we do, how do [we] go about doing [it]. [Are] there any ways to improve student access to the library? . . . In order for that to fall into the overall plan of making the library the centerpiece, a focal point of our school . . . a welcoming area where we can bring our visitors into our school . . . [an] atmosphere . . . where people walk in—especially our visitors—and say, "Oh what a really nice place." Getting more students more access to our collection.

Let's get it on paper what it is we want to do, what improvements we want to happen here. Let's put together a realistic timeline so we can sit down each year and budget for x amount of improvements that are realistic within our budget. And then also . . . overall improvements to the overall operation of our library.

Dan Reid focused the action plan around the idea of updating the library media program Web site. The objective was to create a library media webpage that would be useful to staff members and would help demonstrate the power of the library media center while supporting the library media specialist as an active member of the school community.

I just hope the teachers will see the value of the librarian and the resources that we have. And if they're using it, they're more apt to send kids to use [the library] or they are more apt to, if one teacher uses it, to tell a colleague . . . we actually have this list of resources available so that another teacher, maybe a new teacher that comes on board next year, would know that this is where [they] can go for help in a particular area.

The library is not just left as a stand-alone where [they] send kids to get [a] 40-minute break.

Dan indicates part of the work over the summer was going to involve curriculum mapping software that would be used to correlate resources in the library media program to the curriculum, making teachers more aware of available resources.

This actually allows you to map your curriculum for the entire year . . . it breaks it down by month . . . it's actually a program . . . this is one of the things that they will be working on with the teachers. One of the things that she'll [the library media specialist] be working on specifically this summer is second grade social studies curriculum and how the library will enhance that particular program with our artist in residence . . . They just feel that they have done the same thing for a number of years and they want to change it a little bit, so they're going to use the school librarian to help map that out as well.

This is a finished product that we can see. It's well thought out and this is how you're going to integrate the library into the regular curriculum.

Dan thought they were moving in the right direction with the efforts they had made toward working on the goals for the library media program.

Well I hope that they will want to work with the school librarian. Like I said, I have two teachers right now that have taken the lead to help the school librarian set up the web page and work with their curriculum, particularly. I hope that, once they do a presentation on what they've done, with the staff, that at least a grade level at a time will start working with the school librarian.

Another connection was to be established through the Web site was technology benchmarks for all grade levels, starting with the work done for second grade. The library media specialist was a member of the technology committee and was helping teachers meet expectations related to technology. To help move the technology standards forward, Dan was using the library media center to showcase new technology acquired for their building.

after this summer . . . [the library media center] will be a training center before school, after school. She uses [a smart cart] . . . often with the kids to show them how to look up things online because there's a big screen . . . She's doing some on-line books which are interactive books which is another tool that we bought . . . she was showing me one of the sites that she was excited about and it wasn't a lot of money so I said it was fine, I said we would just put it in the budget next year for her to be involved with this. But, it gets the kids up and moving around and reading at the same time . . . in front of the screen. That's why I put it in the library . . . if you want that to be your focal point, for training . . . then that's where you would have it.

While taking the online course, Vivian Henry worked with her library media specialist to develop the action plan. With the additional funding she hopes to meet with her staff and prioritize what they want to accomplish related to the library media program and how to proceed. One of her objectives was to provide training on the use of literature and technology. The teachers and the library media specialist attended training related to literature circles.

We've had some tech training with our media specialist . . . but we've also expanded that with some literature study . . . workshops that the third grade has taken. So we started with third grade and our librarian she has been very much in the forefront with that . . . she's still working with that and we'll pursue it again next year. She developed lessons that they can work on together both in the classroom and in the library.

[One teacher and the library media specialist] worked closely together in engineering the rest of the team to be a part of a workshop and working together to develop lessons, which she used in the classroom and tied it together with our technology lab time.

Vivian Henry faced the challenge of creating a time allotment when the library media specialist and teachers could plan and create goals together. Another focus of the action plan involved the goal for technology and literature links. To inform classroom teachers about the plan, Brenda did the following,

I started last fall when I was involved in the course, talking to the library media specialist, and then as things progressed early in the fall, third grade

[teachers] wanted to work on the goals together. Cathy [the library media specialist] and I encouraged some of the literacy kinds of things and it just blossomed from there. Our media specialist played a huge piece in that.

Cathy attended the workshops with third grade teachers. They met and created lessons and supported each other and bounced ideas off of each other. She was just in the middle of that . . . I don't know that she directed it . . . but she contributed and in any way that she could, either in the library perspective and in the computer lab mode.

The teachers in Vivian's building seemed excited about the plans.

they were able to take something that they all wanted to do and work together and build that. It's far from being done. They're still excited about it. They want to expand on it. Next fall we want to share some of the things that have taken place, with the whole staff, to bring them . . . more on board. We're far from where we want to be but it's a start.

I and Cathy have talked about it and it's basically . . . [we want] to bring the library media program [to] a central place where she can be involved with first, second and third grade teachers and, whether it be science or whatever curriculum, she can assist and build on [it] with them as a whole team.

She specifically discusses the progress with the third grade.

I think that this year our focus was a little stronger in that our media specialist was very involved with a grade level . . . centered around the arts and literature studies. That was an area that had improved . . . with passing the levy in our line item budgets we have extra staffing. We're hoping to have her [the library media specialist] as our full time media specialist, so that alone will . . . provide more instructional time for collaboration with classroom teachers.

We would hope that, if we were to have a full time librarian, that she would be able to go beyond just checking out books . . . to also team teach with the teacher, some of their curriculum.

For Brenda, the biggest challenge as an administrator in dealing with the library media program was funding and time.

funding and then time [for] professional growth for both the library media program specialist as well as the teachers. I think it would be very important for them to be aware of the possibilities of a media center. You know we have a very seasoned excellent staff but they get into their own four walls and they forget that there are other avenues out there. I guess I would encourage possibly some of the team to get involved in a library

course so that their awareness level is different from what it is right now. I guess that would be a challenge as well.

Demographics

Demographic information was compiled from the Mansfield course general-demographic survey completed by each administrator participant. This included school demographics (e.g., location, type of school, grade levels, student enrollment, free and reduced lunch counts, F.T.E. of the library media specialist, scheduling of the library media center, administrative coursework related to library media programs) (see Appendix P). Demographic data about the participants was also compiled from the same survey (e.g., years as an administrator, years working together) (see Appendix O).

Online Survey Results

The online pre- and post-surveys developed for administrators and library media specialists participating in the study were comprised of statements consistent with the content of the online course and current literature concerning library media program development and evaluation (see Appendix L). The 2005 participants completed only the post-survey due to problems with logging on to the pre-survey before the online course started.

In 2006, administrators took the online survey before and after the online course, which allowed for comparison of their pre- and post-responses. Their pre- and post-survey responses were also compared to the post-survey responses of administrators from the 2005 group. All administrators' post-survey responses were compared to the responses of the library media specialists' survey responses.

The results of the online survey, taken by the 13 administrators and the 13 library media specialists, indicated differences that were minimal with very high ratings for all items on the survey. The lowest mean for any survey item, out of 79 survey items, was 2.3 (somewhat important) on a Likert-scale of 4 with no rating of “Not Important” by any participant. Based on the fact that the sample was very small and the differences so minimal, no statistical tests were conducted.

When the pre-survey, taken by the 2006 study participants, was compared to the post-survey, taken by both the 2005 and 2006 participants, the lowest mean out of 79 was 2.5 (somewhat important); no responses were given with a rating of “Not Important.” The most significant difference from the pre-survey responses to the post-survey responses was a mean increase of .9 for item 16, dealing with the importance of planning time for teachers and the library media specialist to meet and plan instruction (see Appendix N).

On the other hand, some questions from the post-survey did surface with high ratings by all 13 administrators that participated in the survey. Even though, as a group, the administrators had little in common—they were from different school districts, different regions of the United States and participated in two different sessions of the online course—they indicated consistently similar responses on several items (see Appendix Y). The table also shows the comparison to the responses of the participating library media specialists, from the same schools as the administrators, to the same items on the survey.

The library media specialists showed exact agreement with administrators on Items 1a (collection development aligned to curriculum) and 2k (need for a full time, certified library media specialist). But, the only item rated with the same degree of

importance (Very Important) by all 26 participants was Item 1a, an item related to the importance of library media specialists developing and maintaining a library media collection aligned to the curriculum (see Appendix Y).

Library media specialists rated other survey items slightly higher than administrators (see Appendix Z). Items receiving the highest rankings by the majority of library media specialists dealt with ensuring students' understanding of the ethical use of information; ensuring students' ability to evaluate resources for reliability, accuracy and currency; assisting students with the research process; teaching information /library skills (the ability to locate, use and communicate information); promoting student appreciation of literature; and promoting library services (reading, book fairs, etc.). Of these items 1d, 1g and 5j received the highest ranking by all library media specialists (see Appendix Z).

Summary

The findings presented in this chapter represent the mixed methods approach by combining both quantitative and qualitative data to understand the research problem (Creswell, 2003). As Creswell suggests, this approach represents a way to “obtain statistical, quantitative results from a sample and then follow up with a few individuals to probe or explore those results in more depth” (p. 100).

The data analysis facilitated the articulation of the finding through survey instruments as well as the words of the administrators participating in the study. All data provided insight related to the research questions focused on in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5

Summary of Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The basis for this study was the Mansfield University online course, “School Library Advocacy for Administrators,” which was developed as a tool to inform administrators about school libraries and, as a result, develop advocates for school libraries and library media specialists. This study examined the following questions related to the experience of 13 administrators enrolled in the course. When school administrators are provided with in-depth knowledge of school library media programs established by research as well as frameworks of the profession, in what ways do they perceive that they:

1. gain information about school library programs?
2. change their perceptions of library media programs? and
3. change their actions related to their building library media programs (e.g., through scheduling, staffing, program initiatives, professional assignments, evaluation, budgeting, in-services, communications, etc.)?

The focus of the study sought insights related to these questions through the perceptions of the administrator participants as well as through information provided by self-evaluation module surveys, course feedback forms and action plans.

Summary of Findings

Mixed Methods

A mixed methods approach allowed the standardized responses from surveys, action plans, feedback sheets and demographic information to fill in background information about each administrator (e.g., location, school socio-economic status, scheduling and staffing of the library media center) (see Appendices O and P). Standardized responses from the course surveys were used to getting a broader sense of how the administrators rated their knowledge of the online course content (see Chapter 4, Tables 7-11). It also provided the administrators' rating of the online course experience and the value of the content (see Appendix X).

In addition, descriptive/phenomenological methods were used to examine the experiences of the participants (Hatch, 2002) through interviews. The interviews provided access to the administrators' individual interpretations of the meanings assigned to events and acquired knowledge. They gave more in-depth information about what the administrators conveyed as specifically important about the online course content, how they were using the acquired information and indications of how their experience changed their perspectives and/or actions related to their library media programs.

The interviews, surveys, self-evaluations, course feedback sheets and action plans provided multiple perspectives of the participants' experiences. Standardized responses alone were not sufficient to accommodate individual, subjective differences. Thus the interviews help provide a deeper understanding of the participants' perceptions (Seidman, 1998). The mixed methods approach took advantage of multiple sources of information that added depth to the interpretation (Greene & Caracelli, 1997, p. 10). This also allowed

examination of similar information from many sources in addition to member checks, thus verifying findings through triangulation of data. As a result, parallels were established such as gained knowledge from the course, indications of new perspectives and action taken, lack of background information about school libraries and the established value of the course. Through the data, logical, consistent patterns began to emerge (Lincoln, Guba, 1985).

Demographics

The administrator participants in this study were located in nine different states, five different regions of the United States, and in schools of all sizes and grade levels (see Appendix P). The main commonalities held by the administrator participants were the completion of the Mansfield online course and holding the position of principal in a school. The variation of demographics strengthens the reliability of the findings, indicating that the commonly held opinions about the course and its benefits are directly related to course content, the individual circumstances of the participants, and the relevance of the information, not demographics.

The administrator participants, in telephone interviews, were candid about their action plans and the challenges that face them. This candor indicates that their responses were not derived from feelings of obligation due to the funding provided for their action plans or because someone in their district or school asked them to take the course. Instead, participants' individual experiences indicate that as a result of taking the online course they had acquired new understanding, new information, and new perspectives on school libraries, exceeding any pre-established dispositions they might have held. Comments from interviews helped dispel any concern that pre-established attitudes

toward the library media program or the library media specialist preempted or influenced the information shared.

Knowledge of Course Content

The administrators confirmed through survey answers and comments in interviews that they did not have coursework on how to develop and evaluate library media programs in their university level administrative classes. The lack of background information about school libraries aligns with the findings in professional literature and supports the call for inclusion of information about school libraries in administrative coursework (Campbell, 1991; Edwards, 1989; Lau, 2002b, O’Neal, 2004; Roberson et al., 2005; Wilson & Blake, 1993). The administrator participants in this study agreed that the content of the coursework would be valuable to school administrators if added to the coursework for a principal’s certificate.

In the study by Wilson and Blake (1993), administrators offered suggestions for such training including: (a) university course work; (b) in-service seminars or training at the district or state level; and (c) on-the-job experience (pp. 19-25). In this regard, the Mansfield online course fulfills suggestions 1 and 2 for training options—it is a university course offered with university credit or in-service training credit. The Mansfield course also fulfills suggestion 3, on-the-job experience, through implementation of the action plan and resultant communication between the principal and the library media specialist, both due to the administrator’s involvement in the course.

It is important to note that even though half of the participants were not highly satisfied with the online environment, all 12 who responded to the question about content

of the course gave it high ratings (see Table 6). Administrators who participated in interviews reaffirmed the value of the online course content.

Evaluations were filled out by each participant as he or she completed each of the four modules of the online course. These evaluations, along with interview comments, provided insight into the knowledge base of the participants before taking the online course as well as information gained after completing each module.

Administrators, who indicated in each module that they did not know the content covered beforehand, showed understanding of the content following the completion of the module. They indicated that they had gained background knowledge and information about school libraries in each module.

Module 1 focused on the school library and academic achievement. It provided information on available research correlating strong school libraries with student achievement and student learning (see Table 8). All but one of the administrator participants indicated no prior knowledge of the roles of the library media specialist as identified in the national standards (Objective 1D). Most also indicated a lack of knowledge about research studies related to school libraries (Objective 1A) and factors that correlate school libraries to student achievement (Objective 1B). According to Kuhlthau (2007), “few educators have recognized the power of the school library as an integral element in designing the information age school . . . even though recent studies have shown a significant impact of school libraries on student learning” (Kuhlthau et al., 2007, p. 10; Lance & Loertscher, 2001; Todd & Kuhlthau, 2005a, 2005b).

All but one of the administrator participants indicated understanding of Objective C of Module 1, which dealt with recognizing how the school library mission statement is

developed based on the vision of the school. Considering the nature of school programs, it is understandable that most administrators rated themselves as having prior knowledge of this objective since it is standard practice for programs within a school to link to the school mission or vision.

Many administrators stressed, through their comments, a newfound awareness that the library media specialists can and should be involved in school improvement planning and that they should be part of the academic team. They indicated significantly better understanding of the roles of the library media specialist as identified in national guidelines. They also commented on ways they were linking the work of the library media specialist to learning goals in their building. Both topics contributed to one of the main themes that emerged from the interviews.

Administrators indicated on the course feedback forms and in the interviews the importance of having the background knowledge offered in Module 1. They commented on how the information allowed them to articulate the importance of the library media program to others. They also suggested the information provided justification for their support of the library media program and the direction they had taken with their action plans.

Self-assessments for Module 2, Information Literacy & Academic Standards, revealed that prior to the course, the majority of the participating administrators rated themselves as unfamiliar with the information literacy standards (Objective 2A). Also, the majority did not indicate prior knowledge on how information literacy skills align with state academic standards (Objective 2C) (see Table 9). During the interview process, many of the administrators indicated they were glad to have knowledge of the

information literacy standards, reaffirming that they did not know about them prior to the Mansfield course.

Kuhlthau's research on attributes of programs that successfully implement a process approach to information literacy suggests the importance of the team approach involving administrators, teachers, and library media specialists "playing essential roles in the instructional team" (1993, p. 16). When administrators are unaware that information literacy standards exist, it is difficult for them to conceptualize a program in which information literacy is a focus, let alone participate in a team approach for implementation.

Many of the administrators rated themselves as having prior knowledge of the basics of an information problem-solving process (Objective 2B). Since problem-solving is commonly identified in math and science, subjects more familiar to school administrators, it isn't surprising most would indicate knowledge of this objective. What is not clear is whether or not they had familiarity with information problem-solving processes common to the school library media profession (e.g., The Big Six™, The Information Search Process Model, Research Process Model, Pathways to Knowledge, The Research Cycle, and others).

A majority of administrators indicated familiarity with ways to support collaborative practices among teachers and library media specialists (Objective 2D). What is not clear is how they define collaboration. Collaboration is often defined as synonymous with coordination or cooperation, which Montiel-Overall (2006) argues are distinctly different, establishing that "coordination and cooperation may evolve into full collaboration but they serve markedly different purposes" (Section B, Models, ¶ 2).

Pollard (2005), in agreeing with Monteil-Overall, explains, “In many people’s minds [collaboration is] indistinguishable from cooperation and coordination, which are less elaborate and less ambitious collective undertakings” (n. p.). This perspective is further substantiated by the AASL (1996) definition of collaboration, which states, “collaboration is a much more prolonged and interdependent effort” (p. 2), although, it has never been established that classroom teachers endorse this definition (Todd & Kuhlthau, 2005b, p. 90). It is also difficult to know if administrators, like teachers, have embraced the definition in the more elaborate form.

In the third module, *The Library Collection and Flexible Access*, a majority of administrators indicated lack of prior knowledge of two of the objectives of this module. They indicated lack of knowledge of the guidelines needed to develop quality collections (Objective 3C) and information on applying educational research in scheduling the use of the library and the instructional activities of the program (Objective 3D). At the same time most administrators rated themselves with high prior knowledge for the other two objectives. Both of those objectives align with very traditional roles played by school libraries, how a school library collection supports the school curriculum (Objective 3A), and how the collection can help students establish a reading habit (Objective B) (see Table 10).

Module 4, *Revitalization and Evaluation of the School Library Program*, included information related to the AASL School Library Media Program Assessment Rubric (see Table 11). None of the administrators indicated prior knowledge of the program rubric (Objective 4E). Over half of the administrators indicated lack of knowledge about strategies to recruit, mentor, and retain a school library media specialist (Objective 4B).

For the remaining objectives in Module 4, prior knowledge indicated by the administrators was closely split between those who were aware of the objectives and those who were not. About half of the administrators rated themselves as not knowing about adequate staffing levels for school libraries (Objective 4A). Also, half indicated not understanding how the library media specialist's job differs from that of the classroom teacher while not understanding ways to observe and evaluate the library media specialist differently from the classroom teacher (Objective 4C). And, half were unaware of ways to document instructional activities in the library (Objective 4D).

In summary, the administrators' self-rating of prior knowledge of the module objectives indicated that their strongest prior knowledge was linked to the contributions of a school library collection in helping students establish a reading habit. This reflects the most traditional and long established role of school libraries. On the other hand, administrators indicated they were largely unaware of other content specific to school library media programs (e.g., national standards for school library programs and information literacy standards and connections to state academic standards, the roles of the library media specialist and research related to school libraries and guidelines for collection development).

The module survey results align with the literature that shows administrators are unaware of resources and standards available for school library media programs (Alexander & Carey, 2003; Roberson et al., 2005; Wilson & Blake, 1993). The findings related to a lack of coursework on school libraries, and the lack of prior knowledge of library standards and resources also reinforces the importance of efforts to make such information available to administrators and raise their awareness of how library media

programs support established academic standards (Alexander & Carey, 2003; Roberson et al., 2005; Wilson & Blake, 1993).

Administrators' Changed Perceptions

Administrators indicated that they acquired knowledge through the course modules about many topics on library media programs. The majority of administrator participants further indicated that these were areas they knew little about prior to the course. According to the administrators, this information provided new perspectives regarding their library media programs and library media specialists related to three themes: (a) changed perceptions for the library media specialist and the program, (b) improved ability to communicate with the library media specialist and others, and (c) increased awareness of what the administrator can do to support the library media program.

It appears, according to the comments of the administrators in the study, they came to better understand information literacy and how it relates to all academic standards. They acknowledged that the library media specialist has a unique position and should be looked at differently when conducting appraisal and evaluation. As they indicated, this new level of understanding resulted in a change in their perceptions regarding the school library media specialist and the library media program.

The administrators indicated a new understanding of their responsibilities regarding the library media program. They suggested that the course heightened their expectations for the library media program and provided more awareness of what library media specialists can contribute to instruction, teaching and learning, and collaboration. The descriptors used by the principals corresponded to the roles of the library media

specialist as outlined in *Information Power* (AASL & AECT, 1998), the national guidelines developed by the American Association of School Librarians (AASL), and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) (see Table 12).

Participants, in their comments, used words like *personality, communicator, energizer, cheerleader, voice, leader* or *advocate* as important qualities needed by the library media specialists. In the review of the literature concerning the competencies of school library media specialists, Shannon (2002) states,

There is overwhelming evidence of the importance for school library media specialists to possess effective communication and interpersonal skills. These competencies appear basic to all aspects of the work of school library media specialists and are judged essential by school administrators, teachers and school library media specialists themselves. ¶ 6).

The administrators in this study reinforced these same sentiments, suggesting the pivotal role the library media specialist must play, when they used these descriptive words and phrases, *move the program forward, win over the teachers, lead the cause, communicate and serve as the voice of the program.*

Another theme that emerged from the participants' responses was the change in their perceptions of the library media specialist's role in teaching and learning. The administrators suggested the importance of appointing the library media specialist to planning committees as a way of integrating the library media center into the school academic plan of the school. They also suggested linking the library to school improvement plans and having the library media specialist promote the use of technology.

The terms listed under Instructional Partner (e.g., collaborator, expert, involved, team member, integrator, communicator, facilitator, leader, credible, knowledgeable, informed) are clearly focused on the library media specialist as a team player. Administrators described the library media specialist as someone working with teachers, planning instruction, and integrating the library media program with classroom curriculum while contributing specialized skills.

Terms used frequently by the administrators corresponded to the role of Information Specialist. This role description reflected the unique expertise of the library media specialist and appeared to be particularly important to the administrators, especially in the area of technology. They suggested the library media specialist served as a central player in the use of technology and as a professional developer who helped teachers learn about and use technology in instruction.

Seeing the library as something essential to all teachers was also a change in perception indicated by administrators. They suggested, that in order for all teachers to better use the library media center and the library media specialist, inservice was required. Many also commented on the ability of the library media specialist to bring a new perspective and focus to achieving standards—a new way of teaching. The administrators mentioned consistently that they had a new understanding of what the library media specialist can do and how the library media program can be integral to the academic program.

Several of the descriptors used by principals related to the roles of the library media specialist can be placed under the general heading of “leadership” (e.g., facilitator, innovator, involved, cheerleader, voice, communicator, energizer, advocate, planner,

expert, informed, knowledgeable). These descriptors comprise over half of those used by administrators and stress the importance placed on the leadership role for library media specialists. Many of the comments made by the administrators during the interviews emphasized the success of the action plan depended a great deal on the ability of the library media specialist to implement the plan. They stressed the need for the library media specialist to draw the teachers in, be an advocate for the library media program, be available, and make sure teachers know they are there for them. Many administrators emphasized the importance of the library media specialist serving a leadership role on building teams (e.g., curriculum, school improvement, etc.).

Administrators mentioned the role of “professional developer” as desirable for the library media specialist, beyond the connection to technology. This again reflects expectations for the library media specialist to serve in a leadership role. It aligns with the findings of McCracken (2001) where in library media specialists perceive the following factors as important in helping them expand their roles: supportive administrators and teachers; use of new technology, including the Internet; professional development opportunities; their own abilities and attitudes; adequate funding; and clerical support.

Administrators suggested they viewed the library media program in new ways. For two administrators it was related to the environment of the center; they wanted it to be more inviting, larger, and more centrally located. For others, it opened their eyes to new opportunities such as grants and resources. The administrators also suggested there was a need for teamwork and an effort to build the library media program through consensus.

They described the need to build stronger curriculum, using the library more and with a collaborative approach. As one administrator suggested, the library media center should be a place where teachers go first instead of last. For many, it appeared the course had an impact on their perceptions of scheduling the library, the importance of time and access, and the concept that the library should not serve as just a drop off point for students. Another administrator shared that she had concluded that staffing the library media center with volunteers was not a good option—something she had at one time considered.

According to one administrator, the course helped him better understand the language of the library media specialist. It gave him a new way of looking at how she was involved in instruction. He described ways in which he was more informed and knowledgeable and more able to appreciate and support her efforts. The same administrator commented he would not have acted on a grant opportunity that came across his desk prior to taking the course, but his new awareness made him look at the grant as something viable for the library.

Communication is a key factor reflected in the comments by participants—communication with the library media specialist, communication with teachers, and communication with others in the district and the community. As the administrators suggested, the course helped them understand the library media program and made it easier to communicate that information to others. The administrators also specified that gaining a better understanding of the library media program provided insight and focus when communicating with the library media specialist. They suggested that this allowed for more shared expectations and facilitated better planning for the program.

Administrators indicated the course provided information that could be used to gain support for their plans and programs. As they commented, it helped them articulate the importance and value of the library media program and the library media specialist, justifying them to other administrators as well as teachers. Many of the administrators used the course as a vehicle for communicating with the library media specialist not only about the program in general but also about the action plan for the library media program.

The importance of regular communication with the library media specialist was reflected in the comments of the administrators. In some cases it was used to bring the library media specialists along, helping them to update and improve their skills and perspectives. For others, it was used to better understand what the library media specialist was already doing, resulting in more focus and better support by the administrator.

One administrator indicated that creating a job description for the library media specialist was a vehicle for communicating the depth and breadth of the position, providing it with credibility. Administrators also expressed the importance of communication by the library media specialists about their skills, their knowledge of resources available, and how they and the library media program could help teachers meet academic goals for students. The administrators suggested it was essential for communications to go beyond the library—that the library media specialists should be involved in many different aspects of the school and show support and involvement in the whole school program.

Another outcome of taking the course for the administrators was increased insight into what they, as administrators, could do to provide more support and guidance for the library media specialist and the program. The administrators acknowledged their power

to influence teacher attitudes and actions. They also recognized their influence over staffing and budgeting for the library media program. They suggested their time and availability was important to show support and investment so teachers as well as the library media specialist would know the library media program was a priority for the administrator. They indicated that support by the administrator is key to making changes in how the library media program is viewed and integrated in to the academic program. They acknowledged the important role played by them in supporting the school library and library media specialist.

The administrators' influence reached beyond the school to board members, district-level administrators, other principals, the superintendent, parents and community. As one principal said, the course allowed her to be a catalyst for the program. Another administrator suggested it was possible to serve as a leader and an advocate. Administrators shared many examples of how they took action to make an impact on the library media program by focusing on budgeting, staffing, and developing a relationship with the library media specialist. Administrators also expressed expectations for teachers to plan with the library media specialist and integrate the use of the library into their teaching.

Both teamwork and the involvement of teachers are concepts supported by Senge (1999) and Smith (2002) that stress the need to involve others in the change process. Also, as Goodson (2000) emphasizes, the role of the teacher is central to the success of change measures—they must be on board. In a 2005 survey conducted by *School Library Journal* results showed that “library media specialists are key players in creating schools befitting the 21st century. It's up to the education leadership, as well as the community at

large, to recognize, support, and fund their efforts” (Brewer & Milam, 2005). Overall, the administrators indicated several ways in which they had changed their perceptions for the library media program.

Program Changes

Each administrator participating in the study completed an action plan, a requirement of the Mansfield course. The administrators indicated appreciation for “The 13 Point Checklist,” so they could evaluate their programs and formulate an action plan (see Appendix E). They suggested it helped them assess their library media program and zero in on specific needs while, at the same time, identify strengths. Many expressed appreciation for the action planning process. As they indicated, it helped them gain focus for the library media program and set priorities while identifying strategies for change and improvement. According to the administrators, it served as a jump-start for creating a vision for the program, creating a plan and articulating it, while getting others involved in the process.

At the time of the interviews, the 2006 participants had worked on implementing their action plans for an entire school year, while the 2007 participants had only had part of a school year to work on their plans. When interviewed, many administrators were struggling to accomplish specifically what they had outlined in their action plans but were nonetheless making progress in their library media programs.

Often the time and resources were not available to fulfill the specific plans because of new district initiatives, grants, or unforeseen time constraints. Yet, there appeared to be a consistent intention on the part of the administrators to continue to focus on the new direction for the library media program in one form or another. As the

administrators indicated, the action plans provided structure, allowing them to go through the process of identifying efforts to improve the library media program and take action to accomplish the goals.

Change in the library media program was accomplished at different levels in each building. Administrators articulated hope for the future and wanted to accomplish action plan goals and to improve the library media program. They spoke of opportunities where the library media specialists could take on leadership roles, and they spoke of creating library committees. As they suggested, the committees would allow the library media specialist to be involved in planning for the library media program while also involving teachers in the process. Several mentioned changes related to scheduling, working to free the library media specialist from a totally fixed schedule and identifying time when teachers and the library media specialist could meet to plan collaboratively. They also indicated plans to designate inservice hours and staff meetings for library media program related presentations.

Administrators suggested that one outcome of taking the online course was more focused communication with the library media specialist on a regular basis. They also expressed a better understanding of the role of the library media specialist and the function of the library. They indicated that they sought out opportunities to communicate information about the library media program with others such as teachers, other administrators, and school board members, sharing information through conversations, presentations, and meetings. Many suggested they were more watchful for opportunities for the library media program (e.g., school and district initiatives, grant opportunities, working with the community).

Making more of an effort to understand how the library media specialist could support the academic plan of the building was also emphasized by the administrators. Many indicated the importance of evaluating the library media program. They also specified the need to fine tune the evaluation of the library media specialist to better match the job.

Through their comments, they indicated the importance of the administrator as an advocate for the library media program. Many wanted to search out ideas for the library media program and the library media specialist from other districts as a means of helping to improve their programs. The following is a list of additional suggestions by the administrators on making changes to their library media programs:

- Undertake curriculum mapping to connect the library media collection and program to the classroom curriculum.
- Develop Web sites to correlate information literacy, technology, core curriculum standards and resources.
- Seek solutions to scheduling through discussions with the library media specialist and teachers.
- Launch new technology by placing it in the limelight of the library media center and in the hands of the library media specialist.
- Encourage the library media specialist to make presentations at staff meetings and become a staff developer for colleagues.
- Encourage as well as empower the library media specialist to become a member of leadership teams in the building and district (e.g., school improvement, technology, department committees, leadership teams, etc.).

- Emphasize the connection of the library to the overall academic plan of the school.

Increases in the budget were suggested as an opportunity to create full time positions for the library media specialist. Some administrators indicated that they required teachers to plan instructional units with the library media specialist and report the results to them. Others outlined ways they were working to integrate information literacy skills with content areas. In their comments, the administrators explained the value of making suggestions to the library media specialist for program improvement. They also indicated that it was important to create a timeline and set priorities for meeting goals for the program.

Several expressed their support of library program planning by creating a library media committee to look at curriculum mapping. They suggested the action planning served as a tool to link the library to classroom curriculum and to provide ongoing plans for the library media program. They also indicated that it was valuable to share resources from the online class with the library media specialists and others.

These serve as examples of how the administrators in this study made changes in regard to the library media programs in their buildings. Some are subtle, others are more substantial, but all are indicative of what the administrators perceived were important to make positive changes in their library media programs.

A Shift in Language

The language used by the administrators in the interviews and the online course evaluation responses reveals a pattern of discourse that emphasizes what they used to know and think before taking the online course compared to what they know and think

after taking the online course. Through their comments they indicated moving from narrow views of library media specialist's role to a broader understanding of varying roles. They also suggested a shift from seeing the library media program as marginal and isolated to a central focus for the school. Staffing of the library media center appears to become more of a priority with emphasis on wanting a full time library media specialist.

The administrators indicated that, before taking the online course, the library media specialist served as more as a babysitter, seen as an aide or helper. After taking the online course they suggested a shift to seeing the library media specialist as a collaborator and a teacher. They described viewing the library media specialist in a broader role where he or she works with students and teachers, moves beyond the walls of the library, ties into all curriculum areas and helps reach school academic goals. There was a shift from viewing the library media specialist in traditional roles such as checking out books and finding resources to working collaboratively on research projects, being part of the teaching team, meeting standards, as well as providing professional development for teachers. As the administrators indicated from their perspective, the library media specialist had moved from the traditional librarian to a leader with broader responsibilities and varying roles.

There was also a shift in language that indicates a different view of the library media program. It is described as moving from being a marginal, isolated program to one that is central to the educational plan of the building. It is described as being the hub of the school and a system that should be developed and used collaboratively rather than as a stand-alone tool. The library media center is presented as a place where teachers should go first rather than last. In the language of the administrators the library media program

becomes high priority, indicating importance of funding and better staffing. Small and unattractive centers were described as liabilities and larger centers with inviting spaces were preferred.

The availability of the library media specialist appears to become a higher priority after taking the online course. Efforts are discussed for moving away from “drop-off” or “pull-out” programs where students were left with the library media specialists with little or no communication with teachers. The administrators suggested a need for more flexible schedules with time for the library media specialist and teachers to collaborate. Use of volunteers to manage the center was no longer seen as feasible and full time library media specialists became a goal. Para-educators were listed as necessary to help staff the library media center in addition to library media specialists. Language moves from an emphasis on circulation statistics and the number of resources to how the program supports all content areas.

The shift in language from before the online course to after the online course serves as another indication that for these administrators there was a change in their perspectives related to the library media program. What can not be determined is if this was a systemic change in their approach to their library media programs that will endure over time or a change only in vocabulary that could be temporary.

The Online Survey Discussion Points

An online survey related to the online course content was developed for participants in the study. As reported in Chapter 3 and 4, there were minimal differences in the ranking of the items pre- to post-survey, post- to post-, or administrator to library media specialist. This could have been due to the fact that people tend to give high rating

to topics related to libraries when done out of context of a specific setting. The most significant response that appeared was from the pre- to the post-survey with a mean increase of .9 for item 16, dealing with the importance of planning time for teachers and the library media specialist to meet and plan instruction.

Discussion points did emerge from the survey data. For example, as a group, all 13 administrators indicated higher responses on certain items on the post-survey. These were related to responsibilities of the library media specialist, a strong library media program, and responsibilities of administrators as well as tools for evaluating the program (see Appendix Y).

In terms of responsibilities of the library media specialist, the administrators ranked the following as highly important: developing and maintaining a library media collection aligned to the curriculum, working collaboratively with teachers to meet learning objectives, and exhibiting strong people skills. This aligns with many of the actions indicative of the changes administrators made for their action plans.

For a strong library media program they gave ratings of high importance to the support of the principal, sufficient technology, a full time and certified library media specialist, program goals in alignment with school improvement planning, a wide range of up-to-date curriculum related resources, and an up-to-date automated catalog and circulation system. Again, many of these are echoed in the action plans created and acted upon by the administrators.

In terms of the responsibilities of administrators in relationship to the library media program, conducting appraisal/evaluation/observations of the library media specialist was rated with high importance. Tools rated with high importance for

evaluating the library media program included informal visits and formal visits. In their comments on implementing their action plans, many of the administrators emphasized the need to evaluate the library media program and the library media specialist.

Library media specialists and administrators were in agreement on two of these items, rating them with high importance: collection development should be aligned to the curriculum, and there should be a full time, certified library media specialist in the library media center. Library media specialists however rated different items with higher importance. In terms of their responsibilities, of high importance for the library media specialist were ensuring students' understanding of the ethical use of information; ensuring students' ability to evaluate resources for reliability, accuracy and currency; assisting students with the research process; teaching information literacy skills; and promoting student appreciation of literature. In terms of what they should communicate with their administrators on a regular basis, special promotions were rated by 100% of the library media specialists as highly important.

The items that emerged with highest importance to administrators had more to do with the administrative nature of the program. Administrators found people skills and collaboration more important, which also aligns with the issues indicated as important in their goals for their programs. The fact that administrators showed low prior knowledge of information literacy skills on the module self evaluations may indicate why they are more focused on the administrative nature of the program instead of having a higher focus for teaching and learning in their survey responses. On the other hand, teaching and learning in the library media center is very familiar territory to library media specialists, which may explain their choices.

The high rating of special promotions could indicate this tends to be a comfort zone for library media specialists. It may also indicate that this type of program planning is seen as the key to advocacy or it is purely an enjoyable undertaking not only for the library media specialists but also for the students and staff as well. It is also interesting to note, administrators found people skills and collaboration more important than did the library media specialists. Although no generalizations can be made, each of these survey results can spark potential discussion and curiosity about priorities inherent to administrators and library media specialists.

Conclusions

Within the context of this study the administrators who participated indicated that the course content was important not only to them but also would be valuable to other administrators and should be part of university level administrative coursework. They assigned high ratings to content even though they did not give a high rating to the experience of taking an online course. They confirmed that they had not had content in their administrative courses that dealt with development and evaluation of library media programs. The administrators, who rated themselves as not knowing the content of the course modules, consistently rated themselves as knowing the information after completing each module.

They suggested, through examples, how information was gained from the online course. They implied that they gained a better understanding of information literacy and awareness of information literacy standards. They indicated a better understanding of how the library media program and the work of the library media specialist can be linked to the classroom, the curriculum and academic standards. Their comments supported the

idea that the library media center can play an important role in the educational plan for the school. The language used by the administrators revealed a contrast between what they knew, did and thought before taking the online course compared with after taking the online course, indicating changed perspectives toward library media programs.

Identifiable themes emerged from the data that suggests the administrators gained a better understanding of the role of the library media specialist and their expectations changed for library media program. They stressed the importance of communicating with others about the library media program and communicating with the library media specialist on a regular basis.

Advocacy for the program was a sub-theme. The administrators indicated that it was important to help teachers realize the potential of the library media specialist as a collaborator or co-teacher in meeting educational goals for students. Administrators also identified themselves as playing an important role in supporting and advocating for the library media program. They acknowledged that their opinions and their expectations were significant in the eyes of the teachers in their building. They also emphasized the perceived need for planning for and evaluating the library media program as well as the need for a more role specific evaluation of the library media specialist.

On a more personal note, administrators indicated appreciation for an opportunity to hear from other administrators and participate in professional development specifically for themselves. Their comments reflect the many demands that tug at school administrators as they work to meet the needs of students, parents and teachers, and address demands from their districts as well as state and national requirements. They, like the library media specialist, are often loners in their buildings. One administrator

suggested the library media specialist holds some commonality with the principal as another person who works with all teachers and all students and has to know the entire curriculum.

The administrators expressed concerns related to time, money and staffing limitations that created challenges for accomplishing established goals. Often, as they indicated, their best intentions are stalled or pushed down on their priority list when another initiative or expectation takes precedence. These administrators revealed through their comments that they do care about the library media program and they want to see the actualization of their action plans. At the same time they suggest they can not accomplish it alone—the library media specialist has to play an important role and the teachers have to buy into the plan. Several gave examples of how they sought support for the library media program from others (e.g., school board members, superintendents, parents, other administrators).

In summary, the administrator participants in this study provided examples of how they changed their perceptions of library media programs. They indicated how the Mansfield online course provided information that gave them new ideas and concepts about library media programs that they did not previously know. They also suggested that they changed their actions toward their library media programs and began to make changes related to their action plans. Within the confines of this study, for the thirteen administrator participants, it appears the Mansfield course did make a difference for them and their library media programs.

Limitations

Limitations of the study included the virtual nature of the course and the study, with no face-to-face meetings. Also, the format of the course was predetermined, which included pre-established course surveys (e.g., general-demographic survey, module surveys and course survey) and course content. The online survey developed for the study yielded uniformly high scores for all items. The short period of time between the administrators taking the course and putting their action plans into place (nine months for the 2005 participants and five months for the 2006 participants) also could be seen as a limitation.

In future studies these limitations could be addressed in various ways. To capitalize on the course surveys, work could be done with the professor to devise alternative surveys that would be more conducive to data gathering and analysis with consistent language while still meeting the needs of Mansfield University. The online survey could be further analyzed to determine if different questions would provide more useable data. An effort could be made to select timing of courses for study that would allow more time for implementation of action plans.

Another limitation is the fact that participants received professional development funds for participating in the course. This could have compelled them to indicate more progress on their action plan out of obligation to meet the expectations linked to the staff development funds. Also, there was potential for the participating administrators to have a preconceived pro-library media disposition by the sheer nature of signing up to take the course at the request of a teacher or an acting library media specialist in their school. If they agreed to take the online course, the Mansfield student would get a scholarship. This

could be addressed if the course were offered with no professional development funding and having the administrators take the course under circumstances where they were not recruited by Mansfield University students.

Also the researcher's lack of experience conducting formal research is a limitation that is reflected in the study and may impact credibility, even though research protocol was followed with triangulation of data, expert checks, and member checks (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Implications

The concept of critical mass has gained recent attention through contemporary studies in the context of such issues as education, crime, disease and advertisement (Gladwell, 1996, 2002). In his book, *The Tipping Point*, Malcolm Gladwell (2002) described the "tipping point" as "that magic moment when an idea, trend, or social behavior crosses a threshold, tips, and spreads like wildfire" (Back Cover). According to Word Spy, an online dictionary of newly coined words, tipping point is defined as, "In epidemiology, the concept that small changes will have little or no effect on a system until a critical mass is reached. Then a further small change 'tips' the system and a large effect is observed."

Although the impact of this study is not as dramatic as critical mass, something does begin to happen with school library media programs in schools where the administrator has taken the Mansfield online course. At a simplistic level, a comparison can be drawn to the tipping point, acknowledging that the Mansfield course seems to provide an impetus for participating administrators to change their perceptions toward

library media programs and make changes in the library programs in their schools to some degree.

Based on the findings of this study, the Mansfield online course does appear to offer a viable solution for informing educational administrators about school library programs. It also provides an avenue for filling a gap that exists in university level educational administration coursework. It offers an alternative solution to in-depth information for school administrators about school libraries in a short time span, complete with strategies for applying the information.

For many years the school library profession has been hoping for a tipping point or a critical mass, a time when school administrators would have more understanding and be more knowledgeable of school library media programs and their potential within the educational setting. As a 2003 Kentucky study reported, fewer than 10% of the principals responding had taken a college course including content related to school library media specialist and principal collaboration (Alexander & Carey, 2003). Yet, principals who had participated in such course work “rated the library media center significantly higher, 7.00 on a 10-point scale, than the principals who had not taken a course, who rated the value of the library media center at 4.97” (Alexander & Carey, 2003, p. 11). This indicates those who know more about school libraries have a more favorable view of programs. In this regard, finding ways to educate the large majority of the principals with no background information about school libraries is a worthy goal.

Solutions for Informing Administrators

A traditional solution for informing administrators about school library media programs is through one-on-one contact with library media specialists (Baule, 2004;

Hartzell, 2002a; Wilson & McNeil, 1998). In this scenario the library media specialist raises the awareness of the administrator through his or her actions on behalf of the library media program and through interactions with the administrator. This is a phenomenon that is corroborated in an article written by library media specialist, Carl Harvey (2008). Harvey interviewed his principal who establishes he came to learn about school libraries from Harvey, and he has learned to value the program due to the work of his library media specialist. This is a solution that has worked for many library media specialists and principals.

Additionally, there has been an effort to get principal-preparation programs to integrate information about school libraries within their coursework (Wilson & McNeil, 1998). The reality is that the current demands associated with course requirements for university administrative degree programs limit the chances that either content about school libraries or a separate course related to the topic of school libraries will be added to existing programs. Based on the premise that providing formal training opportunities for administrators related to school library media programs is needed, Mansfield University in Pennsylvania provides a new and viable approach to informing administrators about school library media programs through the online course, “School Library Advocacy for Administrators.”

Administrators are identified as key players in the success of the library media program and the success of the library media specialist (Campbell, 1994; Oberg et al., 2000; Rose, 2002), yet research has shown administrators continue to have little understanding of what the library media program is, can be, or should be in the school setting (O’Neal, 2004). Administrators are also unfamiliar with the roles a library media

specialist can play in the school academic program (O'Neal, 2004). An attempt to raise the knowledge level of school administrators in relationship to school libraries through direct, sustained contact of a course, such as the Mansfield online course, has not been the norm.

Online tools that offer ease of access to information anywhere anytime provide potential for delivery options for content similar to that of the Mansfield online course. The Mansfield course was originally developed in 2003. Since then many more options for course delivery have been made available. It is more conceivable now than ever that a virtual course can serve as a workable a solution for informing administrators about school library media programs. Capitalizing on the positive reaction to the content of the online course by administrators in this study, it is possible that similar offerings can supersede the more traditional solution of established administrative classes at the university level.

It is possible to make content similar to the Mansfield course available through state departments, districts, educational service agencies, special initiatives and grants. The course could fulfill professional development requirements or graduate credit for building administrators anywhere in the country. Content similar to the Mansfield online course could be packaged with a set number of modules, to be delivered in a limited timeframe, by trained instructors and made available using delivery options best for the locale (e.g., Blackboard, Moodle, webinar, etc.). This would allow for flexibility of delivery and the potential for a wider audience.

The timing in the educational environment is conducive to restructuring the course to take advantage of initiatives like Partnership for the 21st Century Skills (2004),

the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) *Empowering Learners: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs* (forthcoming 2009), *AASL Standards for the 21st-Century Learner* (2007) and *The National Educational Technology Standards for Students: The Next Generation* (2007). All these initiatives can serve to bridge information of interest to administrators, teachers and library media specialists linked to the learning needs of the student.

Informing Library Media Specialists

The words of administrators reflected in this study can serve to confirm the roles of the library media specialist established by AASL/AECT national standards. Their words indicate certain qualities that library media specialists can heed as important and relevant to the success of their library media programs. The descriptors used by these administrators should be given serious consideration as library media specialists examine their actions and evaluate the roles they are playing in their schools.

According to the administrators who participated in this study, in regard to library media specialists, personality counts, leadership is key, advocacy is essential and communication is imperative. It is also important for library media specialists to realize they still must serve as a central source for educating school administrators about school library media programs on a daily basis. It would be beneficial for library media specialists to participate in a course like the Mansfield online course, with or without their administrator. It could serve as either a good refresher course or as a source of new information.

Hall and Hord (2006) suggest, without the support of the administrator, bottom-up change cannot be maintained while Senge (1999) and Smith (2002) maintain others need

to help orchestrate change. Either way, library media specialists need to contemplate the role of change theories when working with administrators to alter the way the library media program is perceived and used in the school.

Library media specialists can use this study to see through the eyes of administrators and better align their library media agendas to priorities of their administrators and learn to communicate in ways that resonate with what is important to these very busy, often overwhelmed, but key players.

Recommendations for Further Study

The findings in this study show there is potential for further research related to the Mansfield online course and the administrators that have or will participate in the course. The Mansfield course is currently being used as a district initiative where several administrators are taking the course. A longitudinal study of the experiences of these administrators after taking the online course and the impact it has on their library media programs over time would be useful. Determining if the course can continue without incentives would also be a topic to investigate.

Follow-up with the administrators who participated in this study would be beneficial. It would be helpful to determine if they are still using information learned from the course. Have they continued to apply the information in different settings with different circumstances? Have they continued to pursue action planning for their library media programs? What kinds of changes have they continued to make in their programs over time? These are questions that could indicate whether or not the administrators who completed the online course continue to apply the information gained and continue to have similar perceptions of the library media program as reflected in this study.

Examining the perspective of the library media specialists in buildings where the administrator has taken the Mansfield online course would be another important basis for future research. Do these library media specialists perceive that the course is successful in informing their administrators? Do they perceive the course made a difference in how the administrator relates to and supports the library media program? It would also be valuable to have library media specialists and administrators take the course together and conduct research that reflects their experience and the impact it has on their working relationship and the library media program.

Another topic for research would be to investigate how administrators approach change in their buildings after completing the course. How does it align with various theories related to change? What strategies were most successful? Who was involved?

Examination of the discourse that emerged as the administrators discussed their experiences could be the basis of further research. Indications through comments of “before” and “after” perceptions and behaviors related to school library media programs could be further studied for indications of whether or not a change in culture model was occurring for these administrators. Did the comments go beyond changes in vocabulary and become an established part of their approach to management and development of their library media programs? Also, observation of the administrators for emerging types would be another aspect or potential research. How did they approach planning and evaluation of the library media program? Were they enablers? Did they orchestrate? Were there differences, similarities?

Each of these research topics would extend this study. They could serve to give more insight into the value or potential value of the Mansfield online course “School

Library Advocacy for Administrators” as a viable solution to informing administrators about school library media programs.

References

- Alexander, L., & Carey, J. (2003, November-December). Education reform and the school library media specialist: Perceptions of principals. *Knowledge Quest*, 32(2), 10-13.
- American Association of School Librarians [AASL]. (1996). *Collaboration* (Lessons Learned Series). Chicago: AASL.
- American Association of School Librarians [AASL]. (1999). *A planning guide for information power building partnerships for learning*. Chicago: AASL.
- American Association of School Librarians [AASL]. (2007). *Standards for the 21st-century learner*. Chicago: ALA.
- American Association of School Librarians [AASL]. (2009). *Standards for the 21st-century learner IN ACTION*. Chicago: AASL.
- American Association of School Librarians & American Library Association [AASL]. (2003). *Report of findings: KRC Research*. Chicago: ALA.
- American Association of School Librarians & American Library Association [AASL]. (2007). Definitions of advocacy pr marketing. Retrieved October 26, 2008, from <http://atyourlibrary.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aaslissues/aasladvocacy/definitions.cfm>
- American Association of School Librarians [AASL] & Association for Educational Communications and Technology [AECT]. (1998). *Information power: Building partnerships for learning*. Chicago: ALA.
- Blackett, K., & Klinger, D. (2006). Canadian study strengthens the link between school library staffing and student achievement and reading enjoyment. *School Library Media Activities Monthly*, 23(3), 56-58.
- Brewer, S., & Milam, P. (1995). SLJ's technology survey. *School Library Journal*, 51(6), 49-53.
- Campbell, B. S. (1994). *High school principal roles and implementation themes for mainstreaming information literacy instruction*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Campbell, J. (1991). *Principal-school library media relations as perceived by selected North Carolina elementary principals and school library media specialists*. Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Edwards, K. K. (1989). Principals' perceptions of librarians: A survey. *School Library Journal*, 28-31.
- Gladwell, M. (1996, June). The tipping point. *The New Yorker*, 72(14), 32-38.
- Gladwell, M. (2002). *The tipping point*. City, ST: Little Brown. Retrieved on May 27, 2008, from <http://www.wordspy.com/words/tippingpoint.asp>
- Good, C. V. (1966). *Essentials of educational research: Methodology and design*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Goodson, I. F. (2000, April 24-28). Developing chains of change. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA. *ERIC Digest*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 442718).
- Greene, J. C., & Caracelli, V. J. (1997). *Advances in mixed-method evaluation: the challenges and benefits of integrating diverse paradigms*. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2006). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hambleton, A. E., & Wilkinson, J. P. (1994). The role of the school library in resource-based learning. SSTA Research Center Report #9411. *ERIC Resource Document #ED378992*.
- Harada, V. H., & Yoshina, J. M. (2005). *Assessing learning: Librarians and teachers as partners*. Westport: Libraries Unlimited.
- Hartzell, G. (2002a). The principals' perceptions of school libraries and teacher-librarians. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 8(1), 92-110.
- Hartzell, G. (2002b, October). What's it take? *Teacher Librarian*, 30(1), 81-86.
- Hartzell, G. (2003). *Building influence for the school librarian* (2nd ed.). Worthington: Linworth.
- Harvey, Carl, II. (2008, December). Principal perspective, Part 2: The library media program. *School Library Media Activities Monthly*, 25(4), 53-55.

- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in educational settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- International Society for Technology in Education. (2007). *The national educational technology standards for students: The next generation*. Washington, DC: Author. Available at www.iste.org/Content/NavigationMenu/NETS/NETSRefreshProject/NETS_Refresh.htm
- Kachel, D. E. (2003). Partners for success: A school library advocacy training program for principals. *Knowledge Quest*, 32(2), 17-19.
- Kachel, D. E. (2006). Educating your principal. *School Library Media Activities Monthly*, 23(3), 48-50.
- Kuhlthau, C. C. (1993). Implementing a process approach to information skills: A study identifying indicators of success in library media programs. *School Library Media Quarterly*, (Fall), 11-18.
- Kuhlthau, C. C., Maniotes, L. K., & Caspari, A. K. (2007). *Guided inquiry: Learning in the 21st century*. Westport: Libraries Unlimited.
- Lance, K. (2002). What research tells us about the importance of school libraries. *Teacher Librarian*, 30(1), 76-78.
- Lance, K., & Loertscher, D. (2001). Proof of power: Recent research on the impact of school library media programs on the academic achievement of U.S. public school students. *ERIC Digest*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 456 861). Retrieved June 7, 2008, from <http://ericit.org/digests/EDO-IR-2001-05.pdf>
- Lau, D. (2002a, May). Got clout? SLJ's groundbreaking new survey shows the increasing influence of librarians. *School Library Journal*, 48(5), 40.
- Lau, D. (2002b, September). What does your boss think about you? *School Library Journal*, 48(9), 52-55.
- Lewis, C. G. (1990). *The school library media program and its role in the middle school: A study of the perceptions of North Carolina middle school principals and media coordinators*. Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Library Research Service. (n.d.). *School library impact studies*. Retrieved on June 10, 2008, from <http://www.lrs.org/impact.php>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park: Sage.

- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- McCracken, A. (2001). *School library media specialists' perceptions of practice and importance of roles described in information power*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association, Document ID: 202802. Retrieved on November 9, 2008, from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume42001/mccracken.cfm>
- McNeil, A., & Wilson, P. P. (1999-2000). Preparing principals for the leadership role in library media centers. *Applied Educational Research Journal*, 12(2), 21-27.
- Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Montiel-Overall, P. (2006). *Toward a theory of collaboration for teachers and librarians*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association, Document ID: 103493. Retrieved on December 25, 2008, from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume82005/theory.cfm>
- Oberg, D., Hay, L., & Henri, J. (2000). The role of the principal in an information literate school community: Cross-country comparisons from an international research project. *School Library Media Research*, 3. Chicago, IL: American Library Association, Document ID: 202793. Retrieved on January 11, 2009, from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume32000/principal.cfm>
- O'Neal, A. J. (2004). Administrators' and media specialists' perceptions of the roles of media specialists in the schools' instructional programs: Implications for instructional administration. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 45(4), 286-306.
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills*. (2004). Tucson, AZ: Author. Available at www.21stcenturyskills.org/
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluations and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Pollard, D. (2005). *Will that be coordination, cooperation, or collaboration?* Retrieved December 25, 2008, from <http://blogs.salon.com/0002007/2005/03/25.html>
- Pressley, M., & McCormick, C. (1995). *Cognition, teaching, and assessment*. New York: Harper Collins.

- Roberson, T., Applin, M. B., & Schweinle, W. (2005). School libraries' impact upon student achievement and school professionals' attitudes that influence use of library programs. *Research for Educational Reform, 10*(1), 45-52.
- Rose, K. E. (2002). *Profiles in success: The leadership role of the principal as initiator, facilitator, and sustainer of change in Blue Ribbon elementary schools in Illinois*. Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University at DeKalb.
- Scholastic Publishing. (2008). *School libraries work: Research foundation paper*. Scholastic Publishing: Author. Retrieved in 2008, from http://www2.scholastic.com/content/collateral_resources/pdf/s/slw3_2008.pdf
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (2nd ed.). New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Senge, P. M. (1999). *The dance of change: The challenges of sustaining momentum in learning organizations*. New York: Doubleday.
- Shannon, D. (1996, Fall). Education reform and school library media programs: Perceptions of Kentucky's school library media leaders. *School Library Media Quarterly, 25*, 35-41.
- Shannon, D. (2002). Education and competencies of school library media specialists: A review of the literature. American Library Association, Document ID: 202809. Retrieved on November 09, 2008, from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aaslpubsandjournals/slmrb/slmrcontents/volume52002/shannon.cfm>
- Smith, M. E. (2002, October). The myths of change management. *Performance Improvement, 41*(9), 30-32.
- Snyder, T. (2000). *Getting lead-bottomed administrators excited about school library media centers*. Westport: Libraries Unlimited.
- Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Todd, R., & Kuhlthau, C. (2005a). Student learning through Ohio school libraries, Part 1: How effective school libraries help students. *School Libraries Worldwide, 11*(1), 1, 89-110.
- Todd, R., & Kuhlthau, C. (2005b). Student learning through Ohio school libraries, Part 2: Faculty perceptions of effective school libraries. *School Libraries Worldwide, 11*(1), 1, 89-110.

- Todd, R., Kuhlthau, C., & Heinstrom, J. (2005). *Impact of school libraries on student learning*. Institute of Museum and Library Services Leadership Grant Project Report. Retrieved on October 11, 2008, from <http://cissl.scils.rutgers.edu/research/imls>
- Veltze, L. (1992). School library media program information in the principalship preparation program. In J. B. Smith & J. G. Colmena, Jr. (Eds.), *School library media annual* (p. 10). Englewood: Libraries Unlimited.
- Whelan, D. L. (2003). Why isn't information literacy catching on? *School Library Journal*, 49(9), 50-53.
- Wilson, P., & Blake, M. (1993, September/October). A study and a plan for partnership. *Emergency Librarian*, 21 (1), 19.
- Wilson, P., & Lyders, J. A. (2001). *Leadership for today's school library: A handbook for the school library media specialist and the school principal*. Westport: Greenwood.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2003). *The man in the principal's office* (Updated ed.). San Francisco: AltaMira.
- Zmuda, A., & Harada, V. H. (2008). *Librarians as learning specialists: Meeting the learning imperative for the 21st century*. Westport: Libraries Unlimited.

Appendix A

Course Syllabus

LSC6600
School Library Advocacy for Administrators
Course Syllabus
Fall 2006

Debra E. Kachel

Instructor, Mansfield University
Mansfield, PA 16933



Contact information

dkachel@mansfield.edu

15 Conestoga Road
Lancaster, PA 17602
717-393-6205 or 717-575-5210 cell
717-393-4760 FAX

Program Description

Designed as a component of an (Institute of Museums and Library Service) IMLS federal scholarship grant, this online training program for school administrators will increase background knowledge and understandings of the role a quality school library media program plays in the academic success of students.

Program Goals

Upon completion of the five-week program, participants will:

- Understand the mission and purpose of the school library media program and how a quality, well-supported program can increase student learning.
- Increase the knowledge base about collections, access to resources, and evaluation of the school library media program.

- Learn leadership attitudes and actions that will help reconceptualize a student-centered, information-powered school library media program and strategies to provide continued support for it.

Participant's Responsibilities and Requirements

1. Access the BlackBoard course software via the Internet.
2. Complete a demographic survey.
3. Complete both pre and post surveys being conducted by Deb Levitov for her doctoral research (optional).
4. Read online mods and designated required readings or viewings for each mod each week.
5. Participate in the forum discussions for three mods.
6. Develop an action plan and budget to improve their local school library.

Grading/ Continuing Education Hours/ Stipend

No tests or research papers are required. Successful completion includes all of the requirements listed above (number 3 is for those participating in the doctoral student's research).

Those who complete the course will receive a Certificate of Professional Development from Mansfield University for 15 hours. This document may be used in your state to earn continuing professional development. Administrators in Pennsylvania may request Act 48 credit from their local school districts for participation in this program.

In addition, all completing administrators who were recruited by a scholarship student will receive \$500 for their school to be used for staff development to improve their local school library program.

Resources

Books: Alabama Dept. of Education. Literacy Partners: A Principal's Guide to an Effective Library Media Program for the 21st Century. Montgomery, AL: Alabama Dept. of Education, 1999. (Available on the Internet)

American Assn. of School Librarians. A Planning Guide for Information Power Building Partnerships for Learning With School Library Media Program Assessment Rubric or the 21st Century. Chicago: ALA, 1999.

American Assn. of School Librarians and Assn. for Educational Communications and Technology. Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning. Chicago: ALA, 1998.

Kentucky Dept. of Education. Beyond Proficiency: Achieving a Distinguished Library Media Program. 2000. (Available on the Internet)

Library Power: Strategies for Enriching Teaching and Learning in America's Public Schools. New York: DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund, June 1998.

McGhee, Marla W. and Barbara A. Jansen. The Principal's Guide to a Powerful Library Media Program. Linworth, 2005.

Pennsylvania Guidelines for School Library Programs. Harrisburg, PA: PDE, 2005. (Free publication; also available on the Internet)

Public Education Network and the American Assn. of School Librarians. The Information-Powered School. Ed. Sandra Hughes-Hassell and Anne Wheelock. Chicago: ALA, 2001.

White House Conference on School Libraries: Proceedings, 2 June 2002. Washington, DC: IMLS, [2002]. (Available on the Internet)

Brochures: American Assn. of School Librarians. "The Principal's Manual for Your School Library Media Program." [brochure] Chicago: ALA, 2000.

American Assn. of School Librarians. "Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning." [brochure] Chicago: ALA, Aug. 2001.

Pennsylvania Dept. of Education. Measuring Up to Standards: The Impact of School Library Programs & Information Literacy in Pennsylvania Schools. Harrisburg, PA: PDE, Feb. 2000.

"School Libraries Work!" [booklet] Scholastic, 2004

Mod Objectives

Mod 1: The School Library and Academic Achievement

- Relate recent research studies on strong school library media programs and their impact on student learning.
- List factors of a quality school library program that correlate with increased student achievement.
- Recognize how the mission statement for a school library program provides a focus for carrying out the vision for the school.
- Describe the four roles of a school library media specialist as identified in national guidelines.

Mod 2: Information Literacy & Academic Standards

- Define information literacy and give examples of several of the nine identified standards.
- Relate the basics of an information problem-solving process.
- Identify where information literacy skills fit in state academic standards.
- List several factors or supports necessary to facilitate collaborative planning among teachers and library media specialists.

Mod 3: The Library Collection and Flexible Access

- Understand how a school library collection supports the school's curriculum
- Recognize the contributions a school library collection can make in helping students establish a reading habit
- List the inputs and some guidelines needed to develop a quality school library collection
- Apply the educational research in scheduling the use of the library and its program of instructional activities

Mod 4: Revitalization and Evaluation of the School Library Program

- Know what constitutes adequate levels of staffing in a school library.
- Use various strategies to recruit, mentor, and retain a school library media specialist.

- Understand how the school librarian’s job responsibilities differ from that of the classroom teacher and recognize ways to observe and evaluate the total job performance.
- Be familiar with ways to document instructional activities that happen in the library
- Be familiar with and know how to use the AASL’s School Library Media Program Assessment rubric.

Course Schedule

Mod	Topic	Assignment	Dates
1	The School Library & Academic Achievement	Forum 1A: Using school library research Forum 1B: The roles of the school library media specialist	Oct. 16 - Oct. 22
2	Information Literacy & Academic Standards	Forum 2A: Curriculum and information literacy standards in action Forum 2B: Best practices in collaborative units	Oct. 23 - Oct. 29
3	The Library Collection & Flexible Access	Forum 3A: Creative ideas for scheduling the use of the school library Forum 3B: Creative ideas for developing school library collections	Oct. 30 - Nov.5
4	Revitalization & Evaluation	Action Plan: Assessing , planning, and budgeting to improve the school library program through professional development activities	Nov. 6 - 13 Course must be completed by Nov. 17

Appendix B

Definition of Terms

Definition of Terms

The following is a guide to definitions of terms used in this research study.

AASL – America Association of School Librarians.

Administrator – one who manages and leads a school.

AECT – Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

ALA – American Library Association.

Acquisition – the selecting and receiving of instructional materials and equipment for the library media collection.

Advocacy – an on-going process of building partnerships so that others will act for and with you, turning passive support into educated action for the library media program. It begins with a vision and a plan for the library media program that is then matched to the agenda and priorities of stakeholders (AASL Definitions <http://atyourlibrary.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aaslissues/aasladvocacy/definitions.cfm>).

Assessment – process of documenting, usually in measurable terms, acquired knowledge and skills achieved through the educational process linked to learning objectives.

Certified/Endorsed library media specialist – a person who has gone through the process of seeking licensure by meeting local and state educational requirements to work in a school library media setting.

Change – combining “inner shifts in people’s values, aspirations, and behaviors with “outer” shifts in processes, strategies, practices, and systems” (Senge et al., year, p. 14). It involves building for something that is ongoing, including “strategies, structures, and systems” as well as the thinking that produced them (Senge et al., year, p. 14).

Circulation – the activity of the library media center in lending materials to patrons and keeping records of the loans.

Collaboration or collaborative planning –teachers and library media specialists working together as a team to plan instruction that integrates information literacy skills and the use of library media resources within curriculum objectives.

Collection development – systematic plan for adding materials and resources to a library media center and deselecting materials and resources based on the needs of the community served.

Collection mapping – a technique used to assess library media center materials to determine currency and relevancy of items in the collection in relationship to teaching and learning needs and curriculum objectives.

Curriculum – courses, subjects, and content offered as the instructional program of a school.

Evaluation – the qualitative and quantitative appraisal of a program, project, or process to determine if it is effective.

Flexible schedule – scheduling that enables library media center resources to be available to students through out the school day as needed. The library media specialist's time is scheduled relevant to the learning and teaching needs of students and staff.

Fixed schedule – a predetermine schedule for the library media center classes to come to the library as part of a regular special class rotation.

F.T.E. –Full time equivalent, used in reference to staffing quotas.

Goals –aims which guide educational and program planning and may be short- or long-term.

Information literacy – skills and strategies to help access, evaluate, interpret, and communicate information from a variety of sources and formats (AASL/AECT, 1988).

Information Process Model – steps used in dealing with information; the process of acquiring, retaining and using information

Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs -a text that sets forth national guidelines for developing school library media program published by AASL and AECT, 1988.

Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning - a text that sets forth national guidelines for developing the school library media program and teaching information literacy skills. The book was developed jointly by AASL and AECT, 1998.

Inquiry – a process of learning that is driven by questioning, investigation, making sense of and using information and constructing new understandings.

In-service – training opportunities for professional educators.

Integrated program - a library media program that involves the library media specialist, teacher and administrator working together to provide the pertinent information and skills to the student.

Instructional design – planning presentation, delivery methods, learning activities and assessment of a course or unit of study.

Library assistant or clerk – examples of noncertified members of the library media center staff.

Library media center (LMC) – the facility within a school complex where access to educational resources, services, and instruction are facilitated in alignment with the mission of the school and the library media program. Often used interchangeably with the terms: **library** or **media center**.

Library media collection – an all-inclusive term for materials and the accompanying equipment managed through the library media center.

Library media services - services that support the use of library media centers by the school community.

Library media specialist – is a person with an endorsement or certification that includes extensive professional preparation in the field of school librarianship. This is a term that is often used interchangeably with the terms: **school librarian, librarian, teacher librarian** and **media specialist**.

Library media program – the totality of information materials, resources, and equipment in relationship to identified goals and objectives of instruction and services for students and staff in a school.

Marketing – planned and sustained process to assess the customers’ needs and then select materials and services to meet those needs. (AASL Definitions <http://atyourlibrary.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aaslissues/aasladvocacy/definitions.cfm>).

Media – printed, audiovisual, and virtual forms of communication and their accompanying technologies.

Paraprofessional – an example of noncertified members of the library media center staff.

Public relations (PR) – one-way communication that delivers a message addressing who is involved, what they do, when and where, and for whom. (AASL Definitions <http://atyourlibrary.org/ala/mgrps/divs/aasl/aaslissues/aasladvocacy/definitions.cfm>).

Research Process – actions taken to find and use information on a given topic or solve an information problem.

Rubric - a scoring and evaluation tool; a set of authoritative guidelines to give direction to the scoring of assessment tasks or activities

Standards - established instructional content criteria for learning and assessment.

Technologies - having to do with the tools of information retrieval or distribution.

Word wall – is a strategy usually used in relationship to writing and vocabulary. The word wall is “a systematically organized collection of words displayed in large letters on a wall or other large display place in the classroom” (teachnet.com). Word walls are designed to “provide a visual map to help children remember connections between words and the characteristics that will help them form categories”

(<http://www.teachnet.com/lesson/langarts/wordwall062599.html>). In this study, the word wall is used to list words used by the principal participants via surveys, module and course evaluations, feedback sheets, and interviews. Word walls facilitate making connections between words and characteristics that will help to form categories in the process of coding for analysis.

Appendix C

Mansfield Course Brochure



SCHOOL LIBRARIES

CAN IMPACT STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT IN YOUR SCHOOL

DO YOU WANT TO:

- Make the library the instructional hub of your school?
- Increase resource-based, authentic learning for students?
- Create a collegial, collaborative culture among teachers and librarians in your school?
- Maximize the school library program to improve reading test scores?

LEARN HOW

by enrolling in:

LSC 0600
SCHOOL LIBRARY
ADVOCACY
FOR ADMINISTRATORS

A one-credit graduate course offered during the summer.

WHAT SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS WHO COMPLETED THE COURSE SAY:

"I had little understanding of how diverse a good library program had to be: a close and collaborative relationship with teachers, offer staff development on researching options, and national LMS standards-based lessons to just name a few."

"This made me aware of many LMS aspects that I had never learned before (not in any of my education or administrative courses)."

"One of the best graduate courses I took in earning my superintendent's certificate."

All administrators who completed the program rated the content important to their roles as instructional leaders. 75% rated the program as "extremely important."

MANSFIELD UNIVERSITY
mansfield.edu


For additional information regarding this program, visit our web site:
<http://library.mansfield.edu/principals/>
or call the Mansfield University Admissions Office at (800) 577-6826
E-mail: dkachel@mansfield.edu

PARTNERS FOR SUCCESS:

SCHOOL LIBRARY ADVOCACY FOR ADMINISTRATORS

OFFERED BY
Mansfield University
Mansfield, Pennsylvania


MANSFIELD UNIVERSITY



THE RESEARCH
*14 statewide studies
can't be wrong!*

There is a significant body of research conducted in 14 states in the past 10 years that correlates strong school library programs with higher reading test scores on standardized reading tests (www.lrs.org/impact.asp).

LEADERSHIP
As your school's instructional leader, learn what it takes to create a "learning laboratory" through the school library program.



**ONLINE
LEARNING FEATURES**

- Complete in only 5 weeks in the summer at your pace, in your home or office
- Offered through the Keystone University Network which is a division of the Pa State System of Higher Education
- Proven courseware with 24/7 technical support (email and phone)
- Facilitated by a Mansfield University Adjunct instructor who is nationally recognized and has years of practice in public school libraries
- Discuss issues and share ideas with administrators from across the nation
- Develop a revitalization plan for your school library based on best practices and relevant research

THE PROGRAM

Mod 1 THE SCHOOL LIBRARY & ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

- Research studies
- Factors of a quality school library program
- The purpose & mission of the school library
- The four roles of the library media specialist

Mod 2 INFORMATION LITERACY & ACADEMIC STANDARDS

- What is information literacy?
- Using an information problem-solving process model
- Connecting info literacy & state academic standards
- Collaboration among teachers & the librarian

Mod 3 THE LIBRARY COLLECTION & FLEXIBLE ACCESS

- Supporting the curriculum with library resources
- Establishing a reading habit among students
- Guidelines for a quality library collection
- Scheduling library instructional activities

Mod 4 REVITALIZATION & EVALUATION OF THE LIBRARY PROGRAM

- Staffing of the school library program
- Recruitment, mentoring, retaining library media specialists
- Observing and evaluating the librarian and the program
- Documenting instructional activities with the library



THE ADMISSIONS PROCESS

To earn one graduate credit and continuing education hours/credit:

- **Complete the online application at**
<https://ssl.mnsfld.edu/ssl/forms/gradlibapply.cfm>
- **Send in the application fee of \$25**
- **Forward a copy of your teaching certificate**

Tuition and fees can be found at:

<http://www.mnsfld.edu/~accounts/grad.cfm>

Course materials cost is about \$150. They are available at the Mansfield University Bookstore and will be shipped to you UPS.

REQUIREMENTS

- Internet access
- Time commitment – approx. 3 hrs. per week
- Completion of pre- and post-surveys
- Completion of 4 weekly mods with readings
- Participation in 3 online discussions with colleagues and the instructor
- Development of an action plan to improve your school library
- Final project or research

Appendix D

Action Plan

Partners for Success:
School Library Advocacy Training Program for Principals

Professional Development Action Plan

Principal's Name:

Date:

School:

GOAL: To improve the school library program.

OBJECTIVE:

ACTIVITIES:

PEOPLE INVOLVED:

TIMELINE:

RESOURCES PROVIDED BY SCHOOL (time, money, substitutes, etc):

EVALUATION:

(How will you know that improvements will occur? When do you expect to see the results?)

Appendix E

13 Point Library Media Program Checklist

**A 13 Point Library/Media Program Checklist
for Building Administrators**

Rank each of the following items as:

3 = Doing great

2 = Making progress

1 = Needs work

Pick out all the “ones” and write down a single, short-term objective to work on within the next 6 months.

1. Professional staff and duties

- _____ Does your media center have the services of a fully licensed school library media specialist (SLMS)?
- _____ Is that person fully engaged in professional duties? Is there a written job description for all media personnel: clerical, technical, and professional?
- _____ Does the SLMS understand and practice the roles of the SLMS as defined in *Information Power II*?
- _____ Is the media specialist an active member of a professional organization?
- _____ Is the SLMS considered a full member of the teaching faculty?

2. Professional support

- _____ Is sufficient clerical help available to the SLMS so that she/he can perform professional duties rather than clerical tasks?
- _____ Is sufficient technical help available to the SLMS so that she/he can perform professional duties rather than technical tasks?
- _____ Is there a district media supervisor, director, or department chair who is responsible for planning and leadership?
- _____ Does the building principal and staff development team encourage the library media personnel to attend workshops, professional meetings, and conferences which will update their skills and knowledge?

3. Collection size and development

- _____ Does the library media center’s book and audio visual collection meet the needs of the curriculum? Has a baseline print collection size been established? Is the collection well weeded?
- _____ Are new materials chosen from professional selection sources and tied to the curriculum through collection mapping?
- _____ Is a variety of media available that will address different learning styles?
- _____ Have electronic and online resources been added to the collection when appropriate? Is there sufficient hardware for groups of students to take advantage of these resources?

4. Facilities

- _____ Is the library media center located so it is readily accessible from all classrooms? Does it have an outside entrance so it can be used for community functions evenings and weekends?
- _____ Does the library media center have an atmosphere conducive to learning with serviceable furnishings, instructional displays, and informational posters? Is the library media center carpeted with static-free carpet to reduce noise and protect electronic devices? Is the library media center climate-controlled so that materials and equipment will not be damaged by high heat and humidity, and so that it can be used for activities during the summer?
- _____ Is the library media center fully networked with voice, video, and data lines in adequate quantities? Does the library media center serve as the “hub” of these information networks with routers, file servers, video head ends, etc. housed there?

5. Curriculum and integration

- _____ Is the SLMS an active member of grade level and/or team planning groups?
- _____ Is the SLMS an active member of content curriculum writing committees?
- _____ Are library media center resources examined as a part of the content areas’ curriculum review cycle?
- _____ Are library media and information technology skills taught as part of content areas rather than in isolation? Are the information literacy skills of evaluating, processing, and communicating information being taught as well as accessing skills?

6. Resource-based teaching

- _____ Does the SLMS with assistance from building and district administration promote teaching activities that go beyond the textbook?
- _____ Is the SLMS used by teachers as an instructional design and authentic assessment resource?
- _____ Does flexible scheduling in the building permit the SLMS to be a part of teaching teams with classroom teachers, rather than only covering teacher preparation time?
- _____ Is there a clear set of information literacy and technology benchmarks written for all grade levels? Are these benchmarks assessed in a joint effort of the SLMS and classroom teacher? Are the results of these assessments shared with the student and parents?

7. Information technology

- Does the library media center give its users access to recent information technologies such as:
 - computerized library catalogs and circulation systems
 - access to a computerized union catalog of district holdings as well as access to the catalogs of public, academic, and special libraries from which interlibrary loans can be made
 - full online access to the Internet
 - a wide variety of computerized reference tools like full text periodical indexes, electronic encyclopedias, magazine indexes, electronic atlases, concordances, dictionaries, thesauruses, reader's advisors and almanacs
 - a wide variety of computerized productivity programs appropriate to student ability level such as word processors, multi-media and presentation programs, spreadsheets, databases, desktop publishing programs, graphic creation programs, still and motion digital image editing software
 - a wide range of educational computer programs including practices, simulations and tutorials, and production hardware such as multi-media computers, still and video digital cameras, scanners, and LCD projection devices
 - educational television programming and services
 - access to desktop conferencing equipment opportunities
- Are the skills needed to use these resources being taught to and with teachers by the SLMS?

8. Telecommunications

- Is the school linked by a telecommunications network for distance learning opportunities for students? Are there interactive classrooms in the building?
- Does the library media program coordinate programming which can be aired on the local public access channel?

9. Networking & interlibrary loan

- Is your school a member of a regional multi-type system or library consortium?
- Does the SLMS use interlibrary loan to fill student and staff requests which cannot be met by building collections?
- Does the SLMS participate in cooperative planning opportunities with other schools, both locally and distant?

10. Planning/yearly goals

- _____ Does the library media program have a district-wide set of long-range goals?
- _____ Does the SLMS set yearly goals based on the long-term goals that are tied directly to building and curriculum goals?
- _____ Is a portion of the SLMS's evaluation based on the achievement of the yearly goals?
- _____ Is the library media program represented on the building technology planning committee? The district technology planning committee?

11. Budgeting

- _____ Is the library media program budget zero or objective based? Is the budget tied to program goals?
- _____ Does the SLMS write clear rationales for the materials, equipment, and supplies requested?
- _____ Does the budget reflect both a maintenance and growth component for the program?
- _____ Does the SLMS keep clear and accurate records of expenditures?

12. Policies/communications

- _____ Are board policies concerning selection and reconsideration current and enforced? Is the staff aware of the doctrines of intellectual freedom and library user privacy?
- _____ Does the district have a safe and acceptable use policy for Internet and technology use?
- _____ Does the SLMS serve as an interpreter and advocate of copyright laws?
- _____ Does the SLMS have a formal means of communicating the goals and services of the program to the students, staff, administration, and community?

13. Evaluation

- _____ Does the district regularly evaluate the library media program using external teams of evaluators as part of any accreditation process?
- _____ Does the SLMS determine and report ways which show the goals and objectives of the program are being met and are helping meet the building and district goals?
- _____ Do all new initiatives involving the library media and technology program have an evaluation component?
- _____ Do the SLMS and school participate in formal studies conducted by academic researchers when requested?

WORKSHEET FOR THE 13 POINT CHECKLIST

Pick the top seven areas you identified as needing improvement on previous pages. Write one or more objectives you can realistically accomplish to improve in each area of weakness.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

Handout available in: The New Improved School Library, <http://doug-johnson.com>

SOURCE: Reprinted by permission from *The Indispensable Librarian* by Doug Johnson.
Copyright © 1997 by Linworth Publishing,

Inc. All rights reserved.

Appendix F

Mansfield University Permission

April 17, 2005

Dr. Marjorie L. Pappas
Chair, School Library and Information Technologies
Mansfield University
North Hall Library
Mansfield, PA 16933

Deborah Levitov
Student Researcher, UMC
3401 Stockwell Street
Lincoln, NE 68506

Dear Ms Levitov:

You have my permission to conduct the study, "School Administrators' Knowledge, Perceptions and Actions in Relationship to School Library Media Programs Before During and after Participating in the Online Course: School Library Advocacy for Administrators." The participants in your study are students in the online program, School Library and Information Technologies, at Mansfield University of Pennsylvania.

The study will involve the summer sessions for the course LSC 6600 in 2005 and 2006.

Sincerely,

Marjorie L. Pappas, PhD

Chair, School Library and Information Technologies

Appendix G

Administrator Cover Letter

Administrator Consent Form

[date]

Dear Administrator,

The school administrator is pivotal as the building's instructional leader, instituting policies and establishing priorities that directly impact school library media programs (SLMPs). No school library program can be successful without the support and leadership of the building-level administrative team. Administrators generally agree that schools need SLMPs; yet, research on school libraries reveals that administrators are not usually provided with formal background information about library programs. What would if you, as an administrator, were given in-depth information about libraries, providing a better understanding of the role and potential of library media programs; would it impact your perceptions, knowledge and/or actions in relationship to your own library media program?

The online course, "School Library Advocacy for Administrators" provides a unique opportunity to investigate this question, making your contributions and responses crucial to the study. Your library media specialists will also contribute their perspective to the research through a survey, if you both consent to participate.

Your involvement in the study creates a very unique opportunity to exchange ideas and information with you as an administrator regarding SLMPs. It is my hope that you will consent to participate in the study and give me permission to contact your library media specialist to also participate, as outlined in the attached consent form.

In addition to the completing the content of the online course, you will be consenting to completing the enclosed General and Demographic Survey and potentially two other surveys, once the course begins. Your consent will also include you as a potential candidate for interviews after completing the online course (only a small number of subjects will be contacted for interviews). All information provided on any surveys will be confidential and the results will be aggregated to assure that no one can be identified. All information used from the online course and any follow-up interviews will be kept confidential as well. Confidentiality is further addressed in the consent form. This study has been reviewed by the University of Missouri, Columbia, Institutional Review Board.

Please complete the enclosed Consent Form and the General and Demographic survey and return both to me in the enclosed, pre-stamped, pre-addressed envelope by [date].

Thank you for you help.

Sincerely,

Deborah Levitov

Administrator Consent for Research Study

Study Overview:

You are being asked to participate in a research study related to the online course “School Library Advocacy for Administrators”. The study will gather general and demographic information and examine pre- and post surveys related to course content. As the researcher I will be observing online course discussions and postings as well as using the transcripts and course responses (e.g. feedback, evaluations and Action Plans).

Your signature of consent on this form will indicate your permission to participate in the study and will also give me permission contact your library media specialist (LMS) and ask him/her to complete the pre-survey for the study. Both of you will be asked to sign the consent form for participation, acknowledging that you understand that you will be filling out the pre-survey independently of each other. If you are consenting, please indicate the name, email and school address for your LMS on the attached consent form.

Upon your consent to participate in the study you may later be chosen to participate in 3 telephone interviews within nine months following the completion of the course. Each interview session will last approximately 30-45 minutes and will be audio-taped for verbatim transcription. The three interviews will take place at intervals of 5-7 days, scheduled at agree upon times. You will be sent a copy of the transcribed interviews for examination and feedback.

Confidentiality:

In a study of this nature, the confidentiality of participants is a priority. The following are steps taken at each stage of the research process to protect participants.

Confidentiality as it relates to the online course and data:

- 1) All information from the surveys will be aggregated and stripped of all identifiers: names of persons, schools, school districts, cities, towns and counties and pseudonyms will be substituted in the transcripts for all persons.
- 2) Every step will be taken to adequately disguise the participant’s identity in any published materials or presentations to maintain confidentiality and to protect participants in the study.
- 3) Contributions to the online discussions, postings , course feedback, action plans and evaluations will also remain unidentified and confidential.

Confidentiality as it relates to the interviews:

- 1) Interviews will be scheduled only after the participant fully understands the interview process and has signed the informed consent for the interviews.
- 2) All interview information reported will remain confidential and pseudonyms will be substituted in the transcripts for all names of persons and no names of schools, school districts, cities, towns and counties will be used.

I also ask that you give your permission for the research results to be used in professional presentations at national conferences and printed in professional publications. Issues related to confidentiality will be addressed as stated above.

Do not hesitate to call, write or e-mail me if you have any questions or concerns at any time during the research study. My name, address, home telephone number and e-mail address are listed below. You may also contact the Institutional Review board at the University of Missouri, Columbia: [phone and email]

It is my hope that this research will benefit education by providing results that will be useful to other administrators and library media specialists in their educational settings and for others preparing similar educational experiences for administrators. It could also provide new perspectives about school library media programs from the perspective of school administrators.

Please retain this portion as your copy of the consent information and detach and return the consent form, below. Thank you.

Sincerely,

-----Detach and return the bottom portion-----

Participant Consent:

Participation in this research study is voluntary; refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. If I have questions about my rights as a research subject, I can call Deborah Levitov.

I _____ agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Deborah Levitov under the direction of Dr. John M. Budd, University of Missouri at Columbia.

Participant _____ **Date** _____

Please provide the following information for contacting your library media specialist:

Library Media Specialist (choose only one participant): _____

Email address: _____

School Mailing Address: _____

I, the researcher, have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate.

Principal Investigator _____ Date _____

NOTE: If you would like a copy of the research study results, please indicate if you how you would like to receive it (**indicate preference** and **provide needed information**):

___Send results to my email address: ___Send results to my mailing address:

Please return in the pre-addressed, stamped envelope.

Appendix H

General Demographic Survey

17. How many computers are in your building for student use?:
18. How many of these computers have high speed Internet access?:
19. How many computers are in the school library for student use:
20. Provide the number of titles in your school library collection (include books, AV, periodicals, and electronic titles):
21. What was the 2004-2005 budget for the library media center in your building? (exclude supplies, equipment, administrative software or maintenance contracts):
22. My communication with the library media specialist (written or in person) is: (Choose one):
 Once a week Once a month Once a quarter Other (Explain):
23. The library media specialist is assigned to various duties, not related to library services (e.g., playground, recess, hall, etc.) for how much time per day (List in minutes):
24. Which of the following *best* describes scheduling of the library media center at your school (Choose one):
 a. All classes held in the library are flexibly scheduled. (Classes, groups, individuals are scheduled for varying time periods appropriate to need as agreed upon by teachers and library media specialists.)
 b. Some Classes held in the library follow a pre-determined (fixed) schedule; other classes are flexibly scheduled.
 c. Classes are regularly scheduled in the library, typically at the same time, per week or cycle throughout the semester or year (fixed schedule)
25. In your coursework for your Principal Certificate, did you have content that addressed how to develop and evaluate a school library media program? Yes No
26. What district committees does your school library media specialist serve on?
27. What building committees does your library media specialist serve on?
28. Indicate the percentage of time that your school library media specialist spends on the following activities?: (Should add up to 100%)
 a. Check in/check out materials and reshelve
 b. Teaching (e.g., information/library skills, computer use, research skills, etc.)
 c. Administrative tasks (e.g., ordering, collection or facility management, etc.)
 d. Advisory, support (e.g., finding resources for teachers/students, finding information, reader advisory, etc.)
29. How do you evaluate your library media specialist? (Choose one):
 a. using a standard teacher observation/appraisal form

30. Is there a University program available locally (within driving distance) that offers a degree in library science/school library media endorsement? If so, how far away is it?

31. How often is the library information literacy skills curriculum reviewed and revised? (Choose one):

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | a. 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | c. Do not Know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | b. 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | d. Over 10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | e. Do not have |

32. How often is a complete evaluation of the library media program conducted? (Choose one):

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | a. 1-5 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | c. Do not Know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | b. 6-10 years | <input type="checkbox"/> | d. Over 10 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | e. Do not evaluate |

33. Rate your library media program (Choose one):

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | a. Excellent, superior |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | b. Adequate, meets most needs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | c. Below average and needs improvement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | d. Does not meet most needs |

34. Rate the impact that your current school library media program has on student academic achievement (Choose one):

- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | a. Significant | <input type="checkbox"/> | b. Some impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | c. Insignificant |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|

35. Rate the impact that a school library media program could have on student academic achievement (Choose one):

- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | a. Significant | <input type="checkbox"/> | b. Some impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | c. Insignificant |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------|

36. As a child, did you attend an elementary school, that had a school library?

- Yes No

37. Do you believe there is a shortage of school librarians? Yes No

38. How would you rank yourself as a library user?

- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | a. Extensive | <input type="checkbox"/> | b. Moderate | <input type="checkbox"/> | c. Infrequent |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------|

Please return the completed survey to: Deborah Levitov in the **enclosed self-addressed envelope.**

If you have questions, please feel free to email me: ddlmq7@missouri.edu

Appendix I

Library Media Specialist Cover Letter

Library Media Specialists Consent Form

Email to Library Media Specialists

Deborah Levitov
[address]

[date]

Dear Library Media Specialist,

The school administrator is pivotal as the building's instructional leader, instituting policies and establishing priorities that directly impact school library media programs (SLMPs). No school library program can be successful without the support and leadership of the building-level administrative team. Administrators generally agree that schools need SLMPs; yet, research on school libraries reveals that administrators are not usually provided with formal background information about library programs. What would if you, as an administrator, were given in-depth information about libraries, providing a better understanding of the role and potential of library media programs; would it impact your perceptions, knowledge and/or actions in relationship to your own library media program?

The online course, "School Library Advocacy for Administrators" provides a unique opportunity to investigate this question, making your contributions and responses crucial to the study. Your administrator will be participating in the online course and has given us your contact information so that we might have your responses on a survey, if you consent to participate.

Your involvement in the study creates a very unique opportunity to exchange ideas and information with you and your administrator regarding SLMPs. It is my hope that you will consent to participate in the study as outlined in the attached consent form.

You will only be consenting to fill out a pre-survey and I ask that you do you and your administrator do this independent of each other. All information provided on all surveys will be confidential and the results will be aggregated to assure that no one can be identified. Confidentiality is further addressed in the consent form. This study has been reviewed by the University of Missouri, Columbia, Institutional Review Board.

Please complete the enclosed Consent Form and return to me in the enclosed, pre-stamped, pre-addressed envelope by [date]. Once the consent is received, I will email you instructions for taking the pre-survey.

Thank you for you help.

Sincerely,

Deborah Levitov

Library Media Specialist Consent for Research Study

Overview of Participation:

You are being asked to participate in a research study related to the online course “School Library Advocacy for Administrators” in which your administrator is enrolled. The study will gather general information from you on survey. The administrator from your school will also fill out the same survey. Both of you will be asked to sign the consent form (attached) for participation. *I am asking that you please fill out the pre-survey independently of each other.*

Confidentiality:

In a study of this nature, the confidentiality of participants is a priority. The following are steps taken at each stage of the research process to protect confidentiality.

Confidentiality as it relates to survey data:

- 1) All information from the surveys will be aggregated and stripped of identifiers: names of persons, schools, school districts, cities, towns and counties. Every step will be taken to adequately disguise the participant’s identity and teaching location in any published materials or presentations to maintain confidentiality and to protect participants in the study.

I am asking that you give permission for the research results to be used in professional presentations at national conferences and printed in professional publications. Issues related to confidentiality will be addressed as stated above.

Do not hesitate to call, write or e-mail me if you have any questions or concerns at any time during the research study. My name, address, home telephone number and e-mail address are listed at the bottom of this form. You may also contact the Institutional Review board at the University of Missouri, Columbia: [phone and email].

It is my hope that this research will benefit education by providing results that will be useful to other administrators and library media specialists in their educational settings and for others preparing similar educational experiences for administrators. It could also provide new perspectives about school library media programs from the perspective of school administrators.

Sincerely,

Deborah Levitov
[address, phone, email]

Keep this page as your copy of the consent information.

Participant Consent:

Participation in this research study is voluntary; refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am

otherwise entitled. If I have questions about my rights as a research subject, I can call Deborah Levitov.

I _____ agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Deborah Levitov under the direction of Dr. John M. Budd, University of Missouri at Columbia.

Participant _____ Date _____

I, the researcher, have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate.

Principal Investigator _____ Date _____

NOTE: If you would like a copy of the research study results, please indicate if you how you would like to receive it (indicate preference and provide needed information):

___ Send results to my email address: ___ Send results to my mailing address:

Please return in the pre-addressed, stamped envelope.

Dear [name],

Your principal, [name], provided your contact information for a study that she is participating in related to an online course she is taking with Mansfield University. I am a doctoral student at the University of Missouri--Columbia and I am conducting a study related to the online course for administrators called "School Advocacy for Administrators".

I am inquiring to see if you would be willing to take an online survey for my study. If so, I will need your home address so that I can mail the information about the study, a consent form for participation and a preaddressed, posted envelope for returning the signed consent. Everything will be explained in the mailing but I want you to know that the survey results are completely confidential. No participants will be identified.

If you agree to participate, please email me your home address and I will send the material. If you have any questions, you can email me or call me at the number below.

Thank you,

Deborah Levitov

Deborah Levitov
Graduate Student
UMC
[address]
[phone number]
[email]

Appendix J

Interview Consent Form

Interview Consent for the Research Study

Overview of Interview Participation:

In conjunction with your participation in the study related to the online course "School Library Advocacy for Administrators" you have been chosen to participate in 3 telephone interviews that will take place by Mid-May-July of 2006. Each interview session will last approximately 30-45 minutes and will be audio-taped for verbatim transcription. The three interviews will take place at intervals of 5-7 days, scheduled at agree upon times. You will be sent a copy of the transcribed interviews for examination and feedback. The consent form for participation is attached.

Procedure related to interviews:

- 1) All interviews will take place at times we have agree upon.
- 2) Interviews will be transcribed by me as the researcher.
- 3) Any text documents you offer (e.g., plans, budgets, memos, etc.) will only be used for the research data, not for publication.
- 4) As is customary with interview data, pseudonyms will be substituted in the transcripts for all names of persons and schools, school districts, cities, towns and counties will not be identified. Every step will be taken to adequately disguise the participant's identity and in any published materials or presentations to maintain confidentiality.
- 5) The transcripts and audiotape recordings and consent forms will remain in the direct physical possession of the researcher. Tapes will be returned to participants upon request should participants decide to withdraw from the study.
- 6) Participants will be given copies of the transcribed interviews and will be asked to participate review process.
- 7) Participants have the right to withdraw from the study at any time, no questions asked.
- 8) Refusal to participate, or withdrawal from the research project, will have no impact on the participant. A participant who withdraws from the study has the right to request the audiotapes and all copies of the verbatim transcriptions of any interviews that have taken place prior to the decision to withdraw. The researcher will delete any transcriptions stored in electronic formats or in print.

Do not hesitate to call, write or e-mail me if you have any questions or concerns at any time during the research study. My name, address, home telephone number and e-mail address are listed at the bottom of this form. You may also contact the Institutional Review board at the University of Missouri, Columbia: (telephone and email).

It is my hope that this research will benefit education by providing results that will be useful to other administrators and library media specialists in their educational settings and for others preparing similar educational experiences for administrators. It could also provide new perspectives about school library media programs from the perspective of school administrators.

Sincerely,

Keep this page as your copy of the consent information.

Participant Consent for the Interviews:

Participation in this research study is voluntary; refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled. If I

have questions about my rights as a research subject, I can call Deborah Levitov.

I _____ agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Deborah Levitov under the direction of Dr. John M. Budd, University of Missouri at Columbia.

Participant _____ Date _____

I, the researcher, have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate.

Principal Investigator _____ Date _____

If you would like a copy of the research study results, please indicate if you how you would like to receive it (**indicate preference and provide needed information**):

___ Send results to my email address: ___ Send results to my mailing address:

Please return, by [date] to:

Deborah Levitov

[address]

Thank you!

Appendix K

Modules 1 through 4 Evaluation Forms

Mansfield University
School Library Advocacy for Administrators

Module 1 Evaluation Survey

Content of Online Program

For each Mod 1 objective, check one of the first two columns and check one of the last three columns labeled 1, 2, or 3.

Knew Prior = you knew /could do this objective prior to the online course

Didn't Know = you didn't know/couldn't have done this prior to the program.

1 = Could do this without any reference to any materials

2 = Know the main ideas and could do this with some reference to materials received with this program

3 = Don't remember this being included in the online program and would have to research this to do

MOD 1 The School Library and Academic Achievement					
Knew Prior	Didn't Know	Mod Objectives	1	2	3
		1A. Relate recent research studies on strong school library media programs and their impact on student learning.			
Knew Prior	Didn't Know	Mod Objectives	1	2	3
		1B. List factors of a quality school library program that correlate with increased student achievement.			
		1C. Recognize how the school library mission statement is developed based on the vision for the school.			
		1D. Describe the four roles of a school library media specialist as identified in national guidelines.			

**Mansfield University
School Library Advocacy for Administrators**

Module 2 Evaluation Survey

Content of Online Program

For each Mod 2 objective, check one of the first two columns and check one of the last three columns labeled 1, 2, or 3.

Knew Prior = you knew /could do this objective prior to the online course

Didn't Know = you didn't know/couldn't have done this prior to the program.

1 = Could do this without any reference to any materials

2 = Know the main ideas and could do this with some reference to materials received with this program

3 = Don't remember this being included in the online program and would have to research this to do

MOD 2 Information Literacy and Academic Standards					
Knew Prior	Didn't Know	Mod Objectives	1	2	3
		2A. Define information literacy and give examples of several of the nine identified standards.			
		2B. Relate the basics of an information problem-solving process.			
		2C. Identify where information literacy skills fit in state academic standards.			
		2D. List several factors or supports necessary to facilitate collaborative planning among teachers and library media specialists.			

Mansfield University
School Library Advocacy for Administrators

Module 3 Evaluation Survey

Content of Online Program

For each Mod 3 objective, check one of the first two columns and check one of the last three columns labeled 1, 2, or 3.

Knew Prior = you knew /could do this objective prior to the online course

Didn't Know = you didn't know/couldn't have done this prior to the program.

1 = Could do this without any reference to any materials

2 = Know the main ideas and could do this with some reference to materials received with this program

3 = Don't remember this being included in the online program and would have to research this to do

MOD 3 The Library Collection and Flexible Access					
Knew Prior	Didn't Know	Mod Objectives	1	2	3
		3A. Understand how a school library collection supports the school's curriculum.			
		3B. Recognize the contributions a school library collection can make in helping students establish a reading habit.			
		3C. List the inputs and some guidelines needed to develop a quality school library collection.			
		3D. Apply the educational research in scheduling the use of the library and its program of instructional activities.			

Mansfield University
School Library Advocacy for Administrators

Module 4 Evaluation Survey & Course Feedback

Content of Online Program

For each Mod 4 objective, check one of the first two columns and check one of the last three columns labeled 1, 2, or 3.

Knew Prior = you knew /could do this objective prior to the online course

Didn't Know = you didn't know/couldn't have done this prior to the program.

1 = Could do this without any reference to any materials

2 = Know the main ideas and could do this with some reference to materials received with this program

3 = Don't remember this being included in the online program and would have to research this to do

MOD 4 Revitalization and Evaluation of the School Library Program					
Knew Prior	Didn't Know	Mod Objectives	1	2	3
		4A. Know what constitutes adequate levels of staffing in a school library.			
		4B. Use various strategies to recruit, mentor, and retain a school library media specialist.			
		4C. Understand how the school librarian's job responsibilities differ from that of the classroom teacher and recognize ways to observe and evaluate the total job performance of the library media specialist.			
		4D. Am familiar with ways to document instructional activities that happen in the library			
		4E. Am familiar with and know how to use the AASL's School Library Media Program Assessment rubric.			

Appendix L

Online Survey Instrument for Administrators

Online Survey Instrument for Library Media Specialists

**Mansfield University School Library & Information Technologies
Graduate Program**

**School Library Advocacy for Administrators
[date] Pre/Post Information Survey**

We would like you to complete the following survey before the beginning of the online Course, *School Library Advocacy for Administrators*. As an enrollee in the course you will be part of a study involving the online course. The study is being done for Mansfield University, Mansfield, PA. Your responses will be completely **confidential**.

1. Rate the following in terms of importance as they relate to the responsibilities of the library media specialist:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Developing and maintaining a library media Collection aligned to the curriculum.	4	3	2	1
b. Working collaboratively with teachers to meet learning objectives.	4	3	2	1
c. Assisting staff in using information ethically (e.g., copyright, intellectual freedom, etc.).	4	3	2	1
d. Ensuring students' understanding of the ethical use of information.	4	3	2	1
e. Ensuring students' ability to evaluate sources for reliability, accuracy, and currency.	4	3	2	1
f. Assisting student with the research process.	4	3	2	1
g. Teaching information/library skills (the ability to locate, use and communicate information).	4	3	2	1
h. Promoting student appreciation of literature.	4	3	2	1
i. Supporting students' independent reading.	4	3	2	1
j. Providing a variety of nonfiction resources	4	3	2	1
k. Providing a variety of materials at varied reading levels.	4	3	2	1
l. Providing resources to meet student interests and recreational needs.	4	3	2	1
m. Serving in a leadership capacity, e.g. serving on school/district committees.	4	3	2	1
n. Exhibiting strong people skills.	4	3	2	1

2. How important are the following for a strong library media program?:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Library media support staff (paid aides, paras).	4	3	2	1
b. Planning time for teachers and the library media specialist to meet and plan instruction.	4	3	2	1
c. Flexible (not predetermined, not fixed) scheduling.	4	3	2	1
d. The library media specialist seen as an equal teaching partner.	4	3	2	1
e. Support and encouragement of the building principal.	4	3	2	1
f. Promotion of sustained silent reading of self-selected material by students.	4	3	2	1
g. Layout of the library media center that allows varied activities to occur simultaneously.	4	3	2	1
h. Availability of the library media center to the school community throughout and beyond the school day.	4	3	2	1
i. Sufficient technology is available to access information.	4	3	2	1
j. A library media center that provides adequate and appropriate space for instruction and resources.	4	3	2	1
k. A full time certified/endorsed library media specialist.	4	3	2	1
l. A current list (within the last five years) of information literacy/library skills, identified from the curriculum.	4	3	2	1
m. A published library media program mission statement.	4	3	2	1
n. Library media program goals that align with school improvement planning.	4	3	2	1
o. Availability of adequate technical support for hardware and software.	4	3	2	1
p. Subscription databases and the library electronic online catalog can be accessed remotely, from home as well as school.	4	3	2	1

2. How important are the following for a strong library media program? (cont.):

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

q. Presence of a wide range of up-to-date, curriculum related resources.	4	3	2	1
r. A current Board-approved selection policy used for acquisition of library media materials.	4	3	2	1
s. Interlibrary loan that is available for borrowing materials/information from other libraries, schools, or local educational units.	4	3	2	1
t. A written plan for developing the library media collection, over time.	4	3	2	1
u. The library has an up-to-date automated catalog and circulation system.	4	3	2	1
v. A clear school policy for handling questioned or challenged materials.	4	3	2	1

3. How would you rate the following in terms of your responsibilities as an administrator in relationship to the library media program in your building?:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Determining staffing levels for library media.	4	3	2	1
b. Conducting appraisal/Evaluation/Observation of of the certified/endorsed library media specialists.	4	3	2	1
c. Involvement in library media program evaluation.	4	3	2	1
d. Determining library media budget.	4	3	2	1
e. Determining the instructional program for library/information skills.	4	3	2	1
f. Determining the infrastructure (technology, access, space, organization) for the library media center.	4	3	2	1
g. Knowledge of circulation, overdues, lost items.	4	3	2	1
h. Communication with staff on the use of the library media center.	4	3	2	1
i. Communication with staff on collaborative efforts with the library media specialist.	4	3	2	1
j. Setting standards/goals for collection development.	4	3	2	1

4. How important is it to communicate with your library media specialist?:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Once a day to once a week	4	3	2	1
b. Once a week to once a month	4	3	2	1
c. Once a month to once a quarter	4	3	2	1

5. Rate the importance of each item listed below in regard to what the library media specialist should communicate with you as the administrator:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Books/resources acquired.	4	3	2	1
b. Status of overdue.	4	3	2	1
c. Information/library skills taught.	4	3	2	1
d. Number of items circulated.	4	3	2	1
e. Number of students using the library media center.	4	3	2	1
f. Number of classes schedule for instruction in the library media center.	4	3	2	1
g. Planning meetings with teachers.	4	3	2	1
h. Assessment strategies used.	4	3	2	1
i. Budgetary needs and rationale.	4	3	2	1
j. Special promotions (reading, book fairs, etc.).	4	3	2	1
k. Newsletters, communications.	4	3	2	1
m. Examples of collaborative planning & instruction with teachers.	4	3	2	1
n. Involvement in planning and conducting staff development sessions for teachers.	4	3	2	1

6. How would you rate the following in terms of importance when evaluating the library media program?:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. The aesthetic nature of the library media center e.g., comfort, convenience, welcome environment.	4	3	2	1
b. Availability of a regular, written evaluation of the library media program (separate from the evaluation of the library media specialist).	4	3	2	1

6. How would you rate the following in terms of importance when evaluating the library media program?: (cont.):

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

c. A library budget developed yearly and improved over time.	4	3	2	1
d. A specifically written job description, for the library media specialist.	4	3	2	1
e. Opportunities for professional development for library media specialists.	4	3	2	1
f. Involvement of the library media specialist in grant writing endeavors.	4	3	2	1
g. Availability of evaluation/observation tools used for library media specialists--different from that used for classroom teachers.	4	3	2	1
h. Evidence of instructional activities, conducted in the library media center.	4	3	2	1

7. Rate the importance of using the following tools/strategies when evaluating the library media program:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Examination of Student work.	4	3	2	1
b. Teacher interviews or surveys.	4	3	2	1
c. Informal visits.	4	3	2	1
d. Review of standardized test scores of students.	4	3	2	1
e. Discussion/interview with the library media specialist.	4	3	2	1
f. Student interviews or surveys.	4	3	2	1
g. Teacher lesson plans.	4	3	2	1
h. Written library usage reports.	4	3	2	1
i. Library media specialist lesson plans.	4	3	2	1
j. Formal visits.	4	3	2	1

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE SURVEY RELATED TO THE *School Library Advocacy Administrators* ONLINE COURSE!

**Mansfield University School Library & Information Technologies
Graduate Program**

**Library Media Specialists
2005 Information Survey**

We would like you to complete the following survey in relationship to an online course that your administrator is participating in, *School Library Advocacy for Administrators*. The study is being done for Mansfield University, Mansfield, PA. Your responses will be completely **confidential**.

1. Rate the following in terms of importance as they relate to the responsibilities of the library media specialist:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Developing and maintaining a library media Collection aligned to the curriculum.	4	3	2	1
b. Working collaboratively with teachers to meet learning objectives.	4	3	2	1
c. Assisting staff in using information ethically (e.g., copyright, intellectual freedom, etc.).	4	3	2	1
d. Ensuring students' understanding of the ethical use of information.	4	3	2	1
e. Ensuring students' ability to evaluate sources for reliability, accuracy, and currency.	4	3	2	1
f. Assisting student with the research process.	4	3	2	1
g. Teaching information/library skills (the ability to locate, use and communicate information).	4	3	2	1
h. Promoting student appreciation of literature.	4	3	2	1
i. Supporting students' independent reading.	4	3	2	1
j. Providing a variety of nonfiction resources	4	3	2	1
k. Providing a variety of materials at varied reading levels.	4	3	2	1
l. Providing resources to meet student interests and recreational needs.	4	3	2	1
m. Serving in a leadership capacity, e.g. serving on school/district committees.	4	3	2	1
n. Exhibiting strong people skills.	4	3	2	1

2. How important are the following for a strong library media program?:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Library media support staff (paid aides, paras).	4	3	2	1
b. Planning time for teachers and the library media specialist to meet and plan instruction.	4	3	2	1
c. Flexible (not predetermined, not fixed) scheduling.	4	3	2	1
d. The library media specialist seen as an equal teaching partner.	4	3	2	1
e. Support and encouragement of the building principal.	4	3	2	1
f. Promotion of sustained silent reading of self-selected material by students.	4	3	2	1
g. Layout of the library media center that allows varied activities to occur simultaneously.	4	3	2	1
h. Availability of the library media center to the school community throughout and beyond the school day.	4	3	2	1
i. Sufficient technology is available to access information.	4	3	2	1
j. A library media center that provides adequate and appropriate space for instruction and resources.	4	3	2	1
k. A full time certified/endorsed library media specialist.	4	3	2	1
l. A current list (within the last five years) of information literacy/library skills, identified from the curriculum.	4	3	2	1
m. A published library media program mission statement.	4	3	2	1
n. Library media program goals that align with school improvement planning.	4	3	2	1
o. Availability of adequate technical support for hardware and software.	4	3	2	1
p. Subscription databases and the library electronic online catalog can be accessed remotely, from home as well as school.	4	3	2	1

2. How important are the following for a strong library media program? (cont.):

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

q. Presence of a wide range of up-to-date, curriculum related resources.	4	3	2	1
r. A current Board-approved selection policy used for acquisition of library media materials.	4	3	2	1
s. Interlibrary loan that is available for borrowing materials/information from other libraries, schools, or local educational units.	4	3	2	1
t. A written plan for developing the library media collection, over time.	4	3	2	1
u. The library has an up-to-date automated catalog and circulation system.	4	3	2	1
v. A clear school policy for handling questioned or challenged materials.	4	3	2	1

3. How would you rate the following in terms of your administrator's responsibilities in relationship to the library media program in your building?:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Determining staffing levels for library media.	4	3	2	1
b. Conducting appraisal/Evaluation/Observation of of the certified/endorsed library media specialists.	4	3	2	1
c. Involvement in library media program evaluation.	4	3	2	1
d. Determining library media budget.	4	3	2	1
e. Determining the instructional program for library/information skills.	4	3	2	1
f. Determining the infrastructure (technology, access, space, organization) for the library media center.	4	3	2	1
g. Knowledge of circulation, overdues, lost items.	4	3	2	1
h. Communication with staff on the use of the library media center.	4	3	2	1
i. Communication with staff on collaborative efforts with the library media specialist.	4	3	2	1
j. Setting standards/goals for collection development.	4	3	2	1

4. How important is it to communicate with your administrator?:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Once a day to once a week	4	3	2	1
b. Once a week to once a month	4	3	2	1
c. Once a month to once a quarter	4	3	2	1

5. Rate the importance of each item listed below in regard to what the library media specialist should communicate with their administrator:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Books/resources acquired.	4	3	2	1
b. Status of overdue.	4	3	2	1
c. Information/library skills taught.	4	3	2	1
d. Number of items circulated.	4	3	2	1
e. Number of students using the library media center.	4	3	2	1
f. Number of classes schedule for instruction in the library media center.	4	3	2	1
g. Planning meetings with teachers.	4	3	2	1
h. Assessment strategies used.	4	3	2	1
i. Budgetary needs and rationale.	4	3	2	1
j. Special promotions (reading, book fairs, etc.).	4	3	2	1
k. Newsletters, communications.	4	3	2	1
m. Examples of collaborative planning & instruction with teachers.	4	3	2	1
n. Involvement in planning and conducting staff development sessions for teachers.	4	3	2	1

6. How would you rate the following in terms of importance when evaluating the library media program?:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. The aesthetic nature of the library media center e.g., comfort, convenience, welcome environment.	4	3	2	1
b. Availability of a regular, written evaluation of the library media program (separate from the evaluation of the library media specialist).	4	3	2	1

6. How would you rate the following in terms of importance when evaluating the library media program?: (cont.):

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

c. A library budget developed yearly and improved over time.	4	3	2	1
d. A specifically written job description, for the library media specialist.	4	3	2	1
e. Opportunities for professional development for library media specialists.	4	3	2	1
f. Involvement of the library media specialist in grant writing endeavors.	4	3	2	1
g. Availability of evaluation/observation tools used for library media specialists--different from that used for classroom teachers.	4	3	2	1
h. Evidence of instructional activities, conducted in the library media center.	4	3	2	1

7. Rate the importance of using the following tools/strategies when evaluating the library media program:

Scale: 4=Very Important 3=Important 2=Somewhat Important 1=Not Important

a. Examination of Student work.	4	3	2	1
b. Teacher interviews or surveys.	4	3	2	1
c. Informal visits.	4	3	2	1
d. Review of standardized test scores of students.	4	3	2	1
e. Discussion/interview with the library media specialist.	4	3	2	1
f. Student interviews or surveys.	4	3	2	1
g. Teacher lesson plans.	4	3	2	1
h. Written library usage reports.	4	3	2	1
i. Library media specialist lesson plans.	4	3	2	1
j. Formal visits.	4	3	2	1

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THE SURVEY RELATED TO THE *School Library Advocacy Administrators* ONLINE COURSE!

Appendix M

Interview Question Guidelines

Interview Questions

An outline for the semi-structure interviews

Considerable background information was gathered from the administrator participants in the study in the form of surveys, self-evaluations, course feedback, and action plans. Because of this, less of the first interview session will be spent getting acquainted, although some of this will happen by reviewing and confirming information already acquired. The interviews will be divided into three, thirty-minute interviews via the telephone with voice recording that will be transcribed.

Question strands:

Interview #1: Introduction, Online Course Experience & Background Information

The first interview will be spent providing a brief restatement of the purpose of the study and a restatement of confidentiality. It will serve as a review of their demographics. Questions will be asked about taking the online course and content of the course, their perspective of the library media program.

Introductory Statement:

I want to thank you again for participating and taking the time to do the interview. I wanted to be sure to clarify that I am not associated with Mansfield University in any capacity.

I am interviewing you because you have special insight and knowledge that is valuable to my research study related to the Mansfield online course. So, there are no preconceived, right or wrong answers, I just want to gather your ideas and perspective.

I will be taping the interview. As stated in your consent form, all is confidential. Do you have any questions before we get started?

Update/Confirm Demographic Data:

Your school [name] is a (K-5, K-6 or 6-8) setting, correct?

How many students are in your school this year?

What is the full time equivalent (FTE) of you library media specialist this year?

Is your library media specialist in a schedule that is:

1. a fixed schedule where classes come at the same time every week, at a set time
2. or is it a flexible schedule where teachers sign up when appropriate times, as needed

3. or, is it a combination of the two (if so could you explain?)

Do you have clerical positions assigned to the library media center? If so how much time?

Questions about the Mansfield online course:

How was the experience of taking the course online?

Had you taken an online course before?

Did you feel it was a good environment for learning? (If so) Why or Why not?

Were there advantages of the course being online? (If so) What were they?

Were there disadvantages to the online environment? (If so) What were they?

Why did you take the course?

Did you get graduate credit for taking the Mansfield course?

Did you get any other kind of credit for taking the course?

Can you think of anyone else who would benefit from taking the course?

Did you have any experience in your programs of study as an administrator that addressed issues related to library media programs?

Was there any particular module or information provided in the course that you feel was most helpful or informative? [Name the modules]

Course Content:

Do you feel the course content was beneficial to you as a principal?

If no, could you explain why you felt the course was not beneficial?

IF NO: What would have made the course more beneficial to you?

IF YES:

- a. What was most beneficial about the course for you?
- b. Did it change your perspective of the library media program?
In what way?
- c. Did it change your perspective of the library media specialist?
In what way?
- d. Do you think the course changed your perspective about how teachers could use the library media program?
If so, how?
- e. Has it changed your perspective about any of the following:
Staffing of the library media center?
If so, how?
Scheduling of the library media center?
If so, how?

Has it changed your perspective of...

Evaluation of the library media program?
If so, how?

The Role of the library media specialist?
If so, how?
What do you feel should be the major role of the library media specialist?
How can this role be realized?

Did the course change your perception of the library media program in
relationship to teaching & learning?
If so, how?

Questions about their library media programs:

Do you feel the library media program benefits student?
If so, how?

Does it benefit teachers?
If so, how?

Does the LMP make connection to your school academic goals?
If so, how?

Is there something you know this year about library media programs that you did not
know last year? If yes, please describe:

Is there an important role for the library media program to play in your school? (If so)
What is it?

If you were to tell parents about the library media program what would you want them to
know?

Is there some other perspective or dimension that I didn't ask about for which you have
changed your view of the library media program?

Interview #2: Action Plans

The following questions, for the second scheduled interview, will be tailored to the specific administrator participant's Action Plan written for the Mansfield online course. The questions relate to their circumstances, although the questions are similar for each participant.

[Introductory statement: Today I would like to focus on the action plan that you outlined related to your library media program for the Mansfield course.]

Questions:

Action Plan

In your Action Plan you listed...

Have you undertaken any training/action related to your action plan? (If so) Explain.

Could you talk about what you were able to accomplish related to the goals listed in your action plan?

Possible probing questions (depending on each action plan):

1. Did you/will you inform teachers about this goal? (If so) How?
2. Do you plan for the library media specialist to be involved in the planning/implementation? (If so) What is his/her role?
3. Who will conduct the (training, workshops, introductions, etc.) How?
4. What are reactions of the teachers to the idea of the workshops?
5. What expectations do you have of the teachers following the training? Is it important for you to communicate your expectations? (If so) How do you?
6. How do you plan to carry out the goal? What do you hope to accomplish?

How do you feel about steps taken this year for the library media program?

Can you gage changes this year? (If so) What are they?

Involvement of others:

Were there specific people whom you involved in the development of your action plan for the library media program? (If so) Who and why?

Do you think it is important to share the action plan with others? (If so) Why? With whom have you shared you action plan?

Have you taken steps implement your plan? (If so) What steps have you taken?

Were there specific people involved in the implementation of the plan?
(If So) Who? How were they involved?

Do you have a timeline? (If so) Can you describe the timeline and where you are on it?

What do you feel staff, teachers, parents need to know to move the vision for the library media program forward?

Do you have priorities for your library media program? (If so) What are they?

Have you let teachers know your priorities? (If so) How?

How have teachers responded?

Have you let the library media specialist know your priorities? (If so) How?

How has the library media specialist responded?

What do you think is necessary to move your plan forward? (If so) What will it take?

Are there key players in making change come about for the library media program?

(If so) Who are the key players? Why are they important?

Do you play a role in the changes and development of the library media program? (If so)

What is your role?

Do you see the library media specialist playing a role in the changes and development of

the library media program? (If so) What is the library media specialist's role?

Do you see teachers playing a role in the changes and development of the library media

program? (If so) What is the library media specialist's role?

Interview #3: The 13-Point Checklist, Action Plan, and Future Plans.

The final interview will be used to clarify information from the first two interviews (if needed) and revisit the content of the online course and future plans for the library media program.

[Introductory Statement: This is the final interview. There may be follow-up to the first two interviews with questions that will help clarify those transcripts. This interview will review their 13-point analysis/target issues. Also, questions that were not covered will be asked related to the course, the action plan.

Questions:

The 13-Point Checklist and The Action Plan

Did you find the 13-point Checklist helpful? (If so) How?

Did information from the online course impact your choices for the 7 focus areas from the checklist? (If so) How?

Looking at the 13-point checklist is there a problem area connected to the library media program that draws your attention? (If so) What is it? Are there others? Why are these important? Are there solutions? How would this change what you have been doing?

Is there an aspect to your library media program that is particularly strong? Weak? (If so) What is it?

Is it important to incorporate these issues into the goals for the library media program? (If so) How?

Do you feel evaluation of the library media program is important? (If so) Is there a system in place? Was the checklist helpful in this way?
Are there other kinds of information or tools that would be helpful to keep your plan moving forward?

If you were asked to rewrite your action plan, what would you change?

Is there something you feel you can do that is most important in relationship to the library media program? (If so) What would that be?

Do you feel you have significant influence to impact changes in you library media program? (If so) Could you explain that influence?

Has implementation of your action plan impacted your view of the library media program? (If so) How?

Should the library media specialist assume a leadership role in the school?

Is yes, how would you have the library media specialist assume more of a leadership role? How do you see this happening?

Current and Future:

Do you have a vision for you library media program?

If yes: Tell me about your vision for the library media program:

What will it take to realize that vision?

Do you feel this has changed since taking the online course? (If so) How?

Have you shared your vision for the library media program with others? (If so) Who?

Is there anything you would like to change about your program? (If so) What?

What sorts of planning will you need to do to keep things moving forward for the library media program?

How much time do you think it will take to see changes in the library media program?

What do you feel you can do regarding the library media program, what is in your power/control?

Is teacher inservice is important about the library media program? If yes, can you tell me more about how you have provided or will provide the needed inservice?

Is it important for a teaching and learning connection to exist with the library? (If so) How is this happening in your building? Are there things you want to change? If so what?

Does the library media program meet the needs of the classroom teacher? If yes, how? If not, how can the library media program better meet the needs of classroom teachers? How can this be facilitated in the future?

Did you have priorities for the library media program before taking the Mansfield course? (If so) What were those priorities?

Have these changed and if *yes*, how have they changed?

Will you continue to use the information from the Mansfield online course? (If so) How?

Did you share course content from the online course with anyone else? (If so) With whom?

Is there information from the course that would benefit others in your district? If yes, who would that be?

Has certain information from the Mansfield course been more useful? (If so) What kinds of information were most useful?

Is there anything else you would like me to know about your experience in taking the Mansfield course?

Is there anything else you would like me to know related to your library media program?

Is there anything you can think of that I have failed to ask that you feel is important related to your experience during and after taking the online course?

Appendix N

Online Survey Data

Means for Pretest in Fall 2006
Administrators Only
The Means Procedure

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 1	Developing and maintaining a library media collection aligned to the curriculum.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 2	Working collaboratively with teachers to meet learning objectives.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 3	Assisting staff in using information ethically (e.g., copyright, intellectual freedom, etc.).	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 4	Ensuring students' understanding of the ethical use of information.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 5	Ensuring students' ability to evaluate sources for reliability, accuracy, and currency.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 6	Assisting student with the research process.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 7	Teaching information/library skills (the ability to locate, use and communicate information).	6	3.5	0.8	0
Item 8	Promoting student appreciation of literature.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 9	Supporting students' independent reading.	6	3.5	0.8	0
Item 10	Providing a variety of nonfiction resources	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 11	Providing a variety of materials at varied reading levels.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 12	Providing resources to meet student interests and recreational needs.	6	3.7	0.8	0
Item 13	Serving in a leadership capacity, e.g. serving on school/district committees.	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 14	Exhibiting strong people skills.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 15	Library media support staff (paid aides, paras).	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 16	Planning time for teachers and the library media specialist to meet and plan instruction.	6	2.8	1.0	0
Item 17	Flexible (not predetermined, not fixed) scheduling.	6	3.3	0.5	0
Item 18	The library media specialist seen as an equal teaching partner.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 19	Support and encouragement of the building principal.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 20	Promotion of sustained silent reading of self-selected material by students.	6	3.3	0.5	0
Item 21	Layout of the library media center that allows varied activities to occur simultaneously.	6	3.7	0.5	0

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 22	Availability of the library media center to the school community throughout and beyond the school day.	6	3.3	0.8	0
Item 23	Sufficient technology is available to access information.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 24	A library media center that provides adequate and appropriate space for instruction and resources.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 25	A full time certified/endorsed library media specialist.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 26	A current list (within the last five years) of information literacy/library skills, identified from the curriculum.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 27	A published library media program mission statement.	6	3.0	0.6	0
Item 28	Library media program goals that align with school improvement planning.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 29	Availability of adequate technical support for hardware and software.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 30	Subscription databases and the library electronic online catalog can be accessed remotely, from home as well as school.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 31	Presence of a wide range of up-to-date, curriculum related resources.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 32	A current Board-approved selection policy used for acquisition of library media materials.	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 33	Interlibrary loan that is available for borrowing materials/information from other libraries, schools, or local educational units.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 34	A written plan for developing the library media collection, over time.	6	3.3	0.8	0
Item 35	The library has an up-to-date automated catalog and circulation system.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 36	A clear school policy for handling questioned or challenged materials.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 37	Determining staffing levels for library media.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 38	Conducting appraisal/Evaluation/Observation of the certified/endorsed library media specialists.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 39	Involvement in library media program evaluation.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 40	Determining library media budget.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 41	Determining the instructional program for library/information skills.	6	3.7	0.8	0
Item 42	Determining the infrastructure (technology, access, space, organization) for the library media center.	6	3.3	0.8	0

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 43	Knowledge of circulation, overdues, lost items.	6	3.3	0.8	0
Item 44	Communication with staff on the use of the library media center.	6	3.3	0.8	0
Item 45	Communication with staff on collaborative efforts with the library media specialist.	6	3.3	0.8	0
Item 46	Setting standards/goals for collection development.	6	3.3	0.8	0
Item 50	Books/resources acquired.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 51	Status of overdues.	6	2.5	1.0	0
Item 52	Information/library skills taught.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 53	Number of items circulated.	6	2.5	1.0	0
Item 54	Number of students using the library media center.	6	3.0	0.9	0
Item 55	Number of classes schedule for instruction in the library media center.	6	3.2	1.0	0
Item 56	Planning meetings with teachers.	6	2.7	0.8	0
Item 57	Assessment strategies used.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 58	Budgetary needs and rationale.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 59	Special promotions (reading, book fairs, etc.).	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 60	Newsletters, communications.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 61	Examples of collaborative planning & instruction with teachers.	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 62	Involvement in planning and conducting staff development sessions for teachers.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 63	The aesthetic nature of the library media center e.g., comfort, convenience, welcome environment.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 64	Availability of a regular, written evaluation of the library media program (separate from the evaluation of the library media specialist).	6	3.3	0.5	0
Item 65	A library budget developed yearly and improved over time.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 66	A specifically written job description, for the library media specialist.	6	3.2	1.0	0
Item 67	Opportunities for professional development for library media specialists.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 68	Involvement of the library media specialist in grant writing endeavors.	6	3.5	0.8	0
Item 69	Availability of evaluation/observation tools used for library media specialists--different from that used for classroom teachers.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 70	Evidence of instructional activities, conducted in the library media center.	6	3.8	0.4	0

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 71	Examination of Student work.	6	3.0	0.6	0
Item 72	Teacher interviews or surveys.	6	3.3	0.5	0
Item 73	Informal visits.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 74	Review of standardized test scores of students.	6	2.8	1.0	0
Item 75	Discussion/interview with the library media specialist.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 76	Student interviews or surveys.	6	3.3	0.8	0
Item 77	Teacher lesson plans.	6	2.5	1.0	0
Item 78	Written library usage reports.	6	2.7	1.2	0
Item 79	Library media specialist lesson plans.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 80	Formal visits.	6	3.8	0.4	0

Means for Raw Data by Job
Job = Admin
The Means Procedure

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 1	Developing and maintaining a library media collection aligned to the curriculum.	13	4.0	0.0	0
Item 2	Working collaboratively with teachers to meet learning objectives.	13	3.9	0.3	0
Item 3	Assisting staff in using information ethically (e.g., copyright, intellectual freedom, etc.).	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 4	Ensuring students' understanding of the ethical use of information.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 5	Ensuring students' ability to evaluate sources for reliability, accuracy, and currency.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 6	Assisting student with the research process.	13	3.6	0.5	0
Item 7	Teaching information/library skills (the ability to locate, use and communicate information).	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 8	Promoting student appreciation of literature.	13	3.5	0.7	0
Item 9	Supporting students' independent reading.	13	3.6	0.5	0
Item 10	Providing a variety of nonfiction resources	13	3.6	0.7	0
Item 11	Providing a variety of materials at varied reading levels.	13	3.7	0.5	0
Item 12	Providing resources to meet student interests and recreational needs.	13	3.5	0.7	0
Item 13	Serving in a leadership capacity, e.g. serving on school/district committees.	13	3.5	0.5	0
Item 14	Exhibiting strong people skills.	13	3.9	0.3	0
Item 15	Library media support staff (paid aides, paras).	12	3.6	0.7	1
Item 16	Planning time for teachers and the library media specialist to meet and plan instruction.	12	3.8	0.5	1
Item 17	Flexible (not predetermined, not fixed) scheduling.	12	3.7	0.5	1
Item 18	The library media specialist seen as an equal teaching partner.	12	3.8	0.6	1
Item 19	Support and encouragement of the building principal.	12	4.0	0.0	1
Item 20	Promotion of sustained silent reading of self-selected material by students.	12	3.7	0.5	1
Item 21	Layout of the library media center that allows varied activities to occur simultaneously.	12	3.8	0.5	1

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 22	Availability of the library media center to the school community throughout and beyond the school day.	12	3.4	0.8	1
Item 23	Sufficient technology is available to access information.	12	3.9	0.3	1
Item 24	A library media center that provides adequate and appropriate space for instruction and resources.	12	3.8	0.4	1
Item 25	A full time certified/endorsed library media specialist.	12	3.9	0.3	1
Item 26	A current list (within the last five years) of information literacy/library skills, identified from the curriculum.	12	3.8	0.4	1
Item 27	A published library media program mission statement.	12	3.3	0.5	1
Item 28	Library media program goals that align with school improvement planning.	12	3.9	0.3	1
Item 29	Availability of adequate technical support for hardware and software.	12	3.8	0.4	1
Item 30	Subscription databases and the library electronic online catalog can be accessed remotely, from home as well as school.	12	3.4	0.5	1
Item 31	Presence of a wide range of up-to-date, curriculum related resources.	12	3.9	0.3	1
Item 32	A current Board-approved selection policy used for acquisition of library media materials.	12	3.6	0.5	1
Item 33	Interlibrary loan that is available for borrowing materials/information from other libraries, schools, or local educational units.	12	3.7	0.5	1
Item 34	A written plan for developing the library media collection, over time.	12	3.7	0.5	1
Item 35	The library has an up-to-date automated catalog and circulation system.	12	4.0	0.0	1
Item 36	A clear school policy for handling questioned or challenged materials.	12	3.8	0.4	1
Item 37	Determining staffing levels for library media.	12	3.7	0.5	1
Item 38	Conducting appraisal/Evaluation/Observation of the certified/endorsed library media specialists.	12	4.0	0.0	1
Item 39	Involvement in library media program evaluation.	12	3.8	0.4	1
Item 40	Determining library media budget.	12	3.7	0.5	1
Item 41	Determining the instructional program for library/information skills.	12	3.4	0.7	1
Item 42	Determining the infrastructure (technology, access, space, organization) for the library media center.	12	3.3	0.8	1

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 43	Knowledge of circulation, overdues, lost items.	12	2.7	1.0	1
Item 44	Communication with staff on the use of the library media center.	12	3.4	0.8	1
Item 45	Communication with staff on collaborative efforts with the library media specialist.	12	3.6	0.8	1
Item 46	Setting standards/goals for collection development.	12	3.3	0.8	1
Item 50	Books/resources acquired.	12	3.1	0.7	1
Item 51	Status of overdues.	12	2.4	0.5	1
Item 52	Information/library skills taught.	12	3.3	0.6	1
Item 53	Number of items circulated.	12	2.8	0.9	1
Item 54	Number of students using the library media center.	12	3.1	0.9	1
Item 55	Number of classes schedule for instruction in the library media center.	12	3.3	0.8	1
Item 56	Planning meetings with teachers.	12	3.5	0.7	1
Item 57	Assessment strategies used.	12	3.4	0.5	1
Item 58	Budgetary needs and rationale.	12	3.8	0.5	1
Item 59	Special promotions (reading, book fairs, etc.).	12	3.4	0.7	1
Item 60	Newsletters, communications.	12	3.8	0.5	1
Item 61	Examples of collaborative planning & instruction with teachers.	12	3.7	0.7	1
Item 62	Involvement in planning and conducting staff development sessions for teachers.	12	3.6	0.8	1
Item 63	The aesthetic nature of the library media center e.g., comfort, convenience, welcome environment.	11	3.5	0.5	2
Item 64	Availability of a regular, written evaluation of the library media program (separate from the evaluation of the library media specialist).	11	3.3	0.8	2
Item 65	A library budget developed yearly and improved over time.	11	3.7	0.5	2
Item 66	A specifically written job description, for the library media specialist.	11	3.6	0.5	2
Item 67	Opportunities for professional development for library media specialists.	11	3.5	0.5	2
Item 68	Involvement of the library media specialist in grant writing endeavors.	11	3.5	0.5	2
Item 69	Availability of evaluation/observation tools used for library media specialists--different from that used for classroom teachers.	11	3.4	0.8	2
Item 70	Evidence of instructional activities, conducted in the library media center.	11	3.7	0.5	2

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 71	Examination of Student work.	10	3.5	0.7	3
Item 72	Teacher interviews or surveys.	10	3.7	0.5	3
Item 73	Informal visits.	11	3.9	0.3	2
Item 74	Review of standardized test scores of students.	11	3.1	0.8	2
Item 75	Discussion/interview with the library media specialist.	11	3.7	0.5	2
Item 76	Student interviews or surveys.	11	3.5	0.7	2
Item 77	Teacher lesson plans.	11	3.1	0.7	2
Item 78	Written library usage reports.	11	3.3	0.8	2
Item 79	Library media specialist lesson plans.	11	3.4	0.7	2
Item 80	Formal visits.	11	3.9	0.3	2

Means for Raw Data by Job
Job = LMS
The Means Procedure

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 1	Developing and maintaining a library media collection aligned to the curriculum.	13	4.0	0.0	0
Item 2	Working collaboratively with teachers to meet learning objectives.	13	3.9	0.3	0
Item 3	Assisting staff in using information ethically (e.g., copyright, intellectual freedom, etc.).	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 4	Ensuring students' understanding of the ethical use of information.	13	4.0	0.0	0
Item 5	Ensuring students' ability to evaluate sources for reliability, accuracy, and currency.	13	3.9	0.3	0
Item 6	Assisting student with the research process.	13	3.9	0.3	0
Item 7	Teaching information/library skills (the ability to locate, use and communicate information).	13	4.0	0.0	0
Item 8	Promoting student appreciation of literature.	13	3.9	0.3	0
Item 9	Supporting students' independent reading.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 10	Providing a variety of nonfiction resources	13	3.7	0.5	0
Item 11	Providing a variety of materials at varied reading levels.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 12	Providing resources to meet student interests and recreational needs.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 13	Serving in a leadership capacity, e.g. serving on school/district committees.	13	3.6	0.5	0
Item 14	Exhibiting strong people skills.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 15	Library media support staff (paid aides, paras).	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 16	Planning time for teachers and the library media specialist to meet and plan instruction.	13	3.7	0.5	0
Item 17	Flexible (not predetermined, not fixed) scheduling.	13	3.5	0.5	0
Item 18	The library media specialist seen as an equal teaching partner.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 19	Support and encouragement of the building principal.	13	3.9	0.3	0
Item 20	Promotion of sustained silent reading of self-selected material by students.	13	3.5	0.5	0
Item 21	Layout of the library media center that allows varied activities to occur simultaneously.	13	3.8	0.4	0

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 22	Availability of the library media center to the school community throughout and beyond the school day.	13	3.2	0.6	0
Item 23	Sufficient technology is available to access information.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 24	A library media center that provides adequate and appropriate space for instruction and resources.	13	3.9	0.3	0
Item 25	A full time certified/endorsed library media specialist.	13	3.9	0.3	0
Item 26	A current list (within the last five years) of information literacy/library skills, identified from the curriculum.	13	3.6	0.5	0
Item 27	A published library media program mission statement.	13	3.5	0.5	0
Item 28	Library media program goals that align with school improvement planning.	13	3.6	0.5	0
Item 29	Availability of adequate technical support for hardware and software.	13	3.7	0.5	0
Item 30	Subscription databases and the library electronic online catalog can be accessed remotely, from home as well as school.	13	3.3	0.5	0
Item 31	Presence of a wide range of up-to-date, curriculum related resources.	13	3.7	0.5	0
Item 32	A current Board-approved selection policy used for acquisition of library media materials.	13	3.6	0.5	0
Item 33	Interlibrary loan that is available for borrowing materials/information from other libraries, schools, or local educational units.	13	3.2	0.7	0
Item 34	A written plan for developing the library media collection, over time.	13	3.2	0.6	0
Item 35	The library has an up-to-date automated catalog and circulation system.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 36	A clear school policy for handling questioned or challenged materials.	13	3.7	0.5	0
Item 37	Determining staffing levels for library media.	13	3.4	0.9	0
Item 38	Conducting appraisal/Evaluation/Observation of the certified/endorsed library media specialists.	13	3.5	0.5	0
Item 39	Involvement in library media program evaluation.	13	3.5	0.7	0
Item 40	Determining library media budget.	13	3.4	1.0	0
Item 41	Determining the instructional program for library/information skills.	13	3.1	0.6	0
Item 42	Determining the infrastructure (technology, access, space, organization) for the library media center.	13	3.3	0.6	0

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 43	Knowledge of circulation, overdues, lost items.	13	2.6	1.1	0
Item 44	Communication with staff on the use of the library media center.	13	3.6	0.7	0
Item 45	Communication with staff on collaborative efforts with the library media specialist.	13	3.7	0.5	0
Item 46	Setting standards/goals for collection development.	13	2.5	1.0	0
Item 50	Books/resources acquired.	13	3.2	0.6	0
Item 51	Status of overdues.	13	1.9	0.8	0
Item 52	Information/library skills taught.	13	3.5	0.5	0
Item 53	Number of items circulated.	13	2.8	1.0	0
Item 54	Number of students using the library media center.	13	3.4	0.8	0
Item 55	Number of classes schedule for instruction in the library media center.	13	3.4	0.8	0
Item 56	Planning meetings with teachers.	13	3.4	0.7	0
Item 57	Assessment strategies used.	13	3.1	0.6	0
Item 58	Budgetary needs and rationale.	13	4.0	0.0	0
Item 59	Special promotions (reading, book fairs, etc.).	13	3.4	0.7	0
Item 60	Newsletters, communications.	13	3.3	0.6	0
Item 61	Examples of collaborative planning & instruction with teachers.	13	3.3	0.5	0
Item 62	Involvement in planning and conducting staff development sessions for teachers.	13	3.2	0.7	0
Item 63	The aesthetic nature of the library media center e.g., comfort, convenience, welcome environment.	13	3.5	0.7	0
Item 64	Availability of a regular, written evaluation of the library media program (separate from the evaluation of the library media specialist).	13	3.0	0.6	0
Item 65	A library budget developed yearly and improved over time.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 66	A specifically written job description, for the library media specialist.	13	3.4	0.7	0
Item 67	Opportunities for professional development for library media specialists.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 68	Involvement of the library media specialist in grant writing endeavors.	13	3.3	0.5	0
Item 69	Availability of evaluation/observation tools used for library media specialists--different from that used for classroom teachers.	12	3.5	0.5	1
Item 70	Evidence of instructional activities, conducted in the library media center.	13	3.5	0.5	0

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 71	Examination of Student work.	13	3.3	0.6	0
Item 72	Teacher interviews or surveys.	13	3.5	0.5	0
Item 73	Informal visits.	12	3.4	0.5	1
Item 74	Review of standardized test scores of students.	13	2.8	0.8	0
Item 75	Discussion/interview with the library media specialist.	13	3.8	0.4	0
Item 76	Student interviews or surveys.	12	3.6	0.5	1
Item 77	Teacher lesson plans.	13	3.2	0.4	0
Item 78	Written library usage reports.	12	3.3	0.7	1
Item 79	Library media specialist lesson plans.	13	3.2	0.6	0
Item 80	Formal visits.	13	3.1	0.8	0

Means for Posttest in Spring 2006
Administrators Only
The Means Procedure

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 1	Developing and maintaining a library media collection aligned to the curriculum.	7	4.0	0.0	0
Item 2	Working collaboratively with teachers to meet learning objectives.	7	4.0	0.0	0
Item 3	Assisting staff in using information ethically (e.g., copyright, intellectual freedom, etc.).	7	3.7	0.5	0
Item 4	Ensuring students' understanding of the ethical use of information.	7	3.7	0.5	0
Item 5	Ensuring students' ability to evaluate sources for reliability, accuracy, and currency.	7	3.7	0.5	0
Item 6	Assisting student with the research process.	7	3.6	0.5	0
Item 7	Teaching information/library skills (the ability to locate, use and communicate information).	7	3.9	0.4	0
Item 8	Promoting student appreciation of literature.	7	3.6	0.5	0
Item 9	Supporting students' independent reading.	7	3.6	0.5	0
Item 10	Providing a variety of nonfiction resources	7	3.7	0.5	0
Item 11	Providing a variety of materials at varied reading levels.	7	3.7	0.5	0
Item 12	Providing resources to meet student interests and recreational needs.	7	3.6	0.5	0
Item 13	Serving in a leadership capacity, e.g. serving on school/district committees.	7	3.3	0.5	0
Item 14	Exhibiting strong people skills.	7	3.9	0.4	0
Item 15	Library media support staff (paid aides, paras).	6	3.5	0.5	1
Item 16	Planning time for teachers and the library media specialist to meet and plan instruction.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 17	Flexible (not predetermined, not fixed) scheduling.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 18	The library media specialist seen as an equal teaching partner.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 19	Support and encouragement of the building principal.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 20	Promotion of sustained silent reading of self-selected material by students.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 21	Layout of the library media center that allows varied activities to occur simultaneously.	6	3.7	0.5	1

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 22	Availability of the library media center to the school community throughout and beyond the school day.	6	3.2	0.8	1
Item 23	Sufficient technology is available to access information.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 24	A library media center that provides adequate and appropriate space for instruction and resources.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 25	A full time certified/endorsed library media specialist.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 26	A current list (within the last five years) of information literacy/library skills, identified from the curriculum.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 27	A published library media program mission statement.	6	3.2	0.4	1
Item 28	Library media program goals that align with school improvement planning.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 29	Availability of adequate technical support for hardware and software.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 30	Subscription databases and the library electronic online catalog can be accessed remotely, from home as well as school.	6	3.5	0.5	1
Item 31	Presence of a wide range of up-to-date, curriculum related resources.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 32	A current Board-approved selection policy used for acquisition of library media materials.	6	3.5	0.5	1
Item 33	Interlibrary loan that is available for borrowing materials/information from other libraries, schools, or local educational units.	6	3.7	0.5	1
Item 34	A written plan for developing the library media collection, over time.	6	3.5	0.5	1
Item 35	The library has an up-to-date automated catalog and circulation system.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 36	A clear school policy for handling questioned or challenged materials.	6	3.7	0.5	1
Item 37	Determining staffing levels for library media.	6	3.7	0.5	1
Item 38	Conducting appraisal/Evaluation/Observation of the certified/endorsed library media specialists.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 39	Involvement in library media program evaluation.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 40	Determining library media budget.	6	3.7	0.5	
Item 41	Determining the instructional program for library/information skills.	6	3.7	0.5	1
Item 42	Determining the infrastructure (technology, access, space, organization) for the library media center.	6	3.5	0.5	1

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 43	Knowledge of circulation, overdues, lost items.	6	2.8	0.8	1
Item 44	Communication with staff on the use of the library media center.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 45	Communication with staff on collaborative efforts with the library media specialist.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 46	Setting standards/goals for collection development.	6	3.3	0.5	1
Item 50	Books/resources acquired.	6	3.0	0.6	1
Item 51	Status of overdues.	6	2.5	0.5	1
Item 52	Information/library skills taught.	6	3.3	0.5	1
Item 53	Number of items circulated.	6	2.7	0.5	1
Item 54	Number of students using the library media center.	6	3.0	0.6	1
Item 55	Number of classes schedule for instruction in the library media center.	6	3.3	0.8	1
Item 56	Planning meetings with teachers.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 57	Assessment strategies used.	6	3.5	0.5	1
Item 58	Budgetary needs and rationale.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 59	Special promotions (reading, book fairs, etc.).	6	3.7	0.5	1
Item 60	Newsletters, communications.	6	3.8	0.4	1
Item 61	Examples of collaborative planning & instruction with teachers.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 62	Involvement in planning and conducting staff development sessions for teachers.	6	4.0	0.0	1
Item 63	The aesthetic nature of the library media center e.g., comfort, convenience, welcome environment.	5	3.4	0.5	2
Item 64	Availability of a regular, written evaluation of the library media program (separate from the evaluation of the library media specialist).	5	3.6	0.5	2
Item 65	A library budget developed yearly and improved over time.	5	3.8	0.4	2
Item 66	A specifically written job description, for the library media specialist.	5	3.8	0.4	2
Item 67	Opportunities for professional development for library media specialists.	5	3.6	0.5	2
Item 68	Involvement of the library media specialist in grant writing endeavors.	5	3.6	0.5	2
Item 69	Availability of evaluation/observation tools used for library media specialists--different from that used for classroom teachers.	5	3.4	0.5	2
Item 70	Evidence of instructional activities, conducted in the library media center.	5	3.6	0.5	2

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 71	Examination of Student work.	5	3.8	0.4	2
Item 72	Teacher interviews or surveys.	5	3.8	0.4	2
Item 73	Informal visits.	5	3.8	0.4	2
Item 74	Review of standardized test scores of students.	5	3.4	0.5	2
Item 75	Discussion/interview with the library media specialist.	5	4.0	0.0	2
Item 76	Student interviews or surveys.	5	3.8	0.4	2
Item 77	Teacher lesson plans.	5	3.4	0.5	2
Item 78	Written library usage reports.	5	3.4	0.5	2
Item 79	Library media specialist lesson plans.	5	3.4	0.5	2
Item 80	Formal visits.	5	3.8	0.4	2

Means for Posttest in Spring 2007
Administrators Only
The Means Procedure

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 1	Developing and maintaining a library media collection aligned to the curriculum.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 2	Working collaboratively with teachers to meet learning objectives.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 3	Assisting staff in using information ethically (e.g., copyright, intellectual freedom, etc.).	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 4	Ensuring students' understanding of the ethical use of information.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 5	Ensuring students' ability to evaluate sources for reliability, accuracy, and currency.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 6	Assisting student with the research process.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 7	Teaching information/library skills (the ability to locate, use and communicate information).	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 8	Promoting student appreciation of literature.	6	3.5	0.8	0
Item 9	Supporting students' independent reading.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 10	Providing a variety of nonfiction resources	6	3.5	0.8	0
Item 11	Providing a variety of materials at varied reading levels.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 12	Providing resources to meet student interests and recreational needs.	6	3.5	0.8	0
Item 13	Serving in a leadership capacity, e.g. serving on school/district committees.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 14	Exhibiting strong people skills.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 15	Library media support staff (paid aides, paras).	6	3.7	0.8	0
Item 16	Planning time for teachers and the library media specialist to meet and plan instruction.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 17	Flexible (not predetermined, not fixed) scheduling.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 18	The library media specialist seen as an equal teaching partner.	6	3.5	0.8	0
Item 19	Support and encouragement of the building principal.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 20	Promotion of sustained silent reading of self-selected material by students.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 21	Layout of the library media center that allows varied activities to occur simultaneously.	6	3.8	0.4	0

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 22	Availability of the library media center to the school community throughout and beyond the school day.	6	3.7	0.8	0
Item 23	Sufficient technology is available to access information.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 24	A library media center that provides adequate and appropriate space for instruction and resources.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 25	A full time certified/endorsed library media specialist.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 26	A current list (within the last five years) of information literacy/library skills, identified from the curriculum.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 27	A published library media program mission statement.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 28	Library media program goals that align with school improvement planning.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 29	Availability of adequate technical support for hardware and software.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 30	Subscription databases and the library electronic online catalog can be accessed remotely, from home as well as school.	6	3.3	0.5	0
Item 31	Presence of a wide range of up-to-date, curriculum related resources.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 32	A current Board-approved selection policy used for acquisition of library media materials.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 33	Interlibrary loan that is available for borrowing materials/information from other libraries, schools, or local educational units.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 34	A written plan for developing the library media collection, over time.	6	3.8	0.4	0
Item 35	The library has an up-to-date automated catalog and circulation system.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 36	A clear school policy for handling questioned or challenged materials.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 37	Determining staffing levels for library media.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 38	Conducting appraisal/Evaluation/Observation of the certified/endorsed library media specialists.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 39	Involvement in library media program evaluation.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 40	Determining library media budget.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 41	Determining the instructional program for library/information skills.	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 42	Determining the infrastructure (technology, access, space, organization) for the library media center.	6	3.0	0.9	0

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 43	Knowledge of circulation, overdues, lost items.	6	2.5	1.2	0
Item 44	Communication with staff on the use of the library media center.	6	3.0	0.9	0
Item 45	Communication with staff on collaborative efforts with the library media specialist.	6	3.2	1.0	0
Item 46	Setting standards/goals for collection development.	6	3.2	1.0	0
Item 50	Books/resources acquired.	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 51	Status of overdues.	6	2.3	0.5	0
Item 52	Information/library skills taught.	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 53	Number of items circulated.	6	2.8	1.2	0
Item 54	Number of students using the library media center.	6	3.2	1.2	0
Item 55	Number of classes schedule for instruction in the library media center.	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 56	Planning meetings with teachers.	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 57	Assessment strategies used.	6	3.3	0.5	0
Item 58	Budgetary needs and rationale.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 59	Special promotions (reading, book fairs, etc.).	6	3.2	0.8	0
Item 60	Newsletters, communications.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 61	Examples of collaborative planning & instruction with teachers.	6	3.3	0.8	0
Item 62	Involvement in planning and conducting staff development sessions for teachers.	6	3.2	1.0	0
Item 63	The aesthetic nature of the library media center e.g., comfort, convenience, welcome environment.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 64	Availability of a regular, written evaluation of the library media program (separate from the evaluation of the library media specialist).	6	3.0	0.9	0
Item 65	A library budget developed yearly and improved over time.	6	3.7	0.5	0
Item 66	A specifically written job description, for the library media specialist.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 67	Opportunities for professional development for library media specialists.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 68	Involvement of the library media specialist in grant writing endeavors.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 69	Availability of evaluation/observation tools used for library media specialists--different from that used for classroom teachers.	6	3.3	1.0	0
Item 70	Evidence of instructional activities, conducted in the library media center.	6	3.8	0.4	0

Variable	Label	N	Mean	Std Dev	N Miss
Item 71	Examination of Student work.	5	3.2	0.8	1
Item 72	Teacher interviews or surveys.	5	3.6	0.5	1
Item 73	Informal visits.	6	4.0	0.0	0
Item 74	Review of standardized test scores of students.	6	2.8	1.0	0
Item 75	Discussion/interview with the library media specialist.	6	3.5	0.5	0
Item 76	Student interviews or surveys.	6	.3.	0.8	0
Item 77	Teacher lesson plans.	6	2.8	0.8	0
Item 78	Written library usage reports.	6	3.2	1.0	0
Item 79	Library media specialist lesson plans.	6	3.3	0.8	0
Item 80	Formal visits.	6	4.0	0.0	0

Appendix O

Participant Demographics

Administrators	Years as an Administrator	Library Media Specialists	Grade Levels	Years Working Together
Jillian Loft *	9 years	Ellie Schmidt	Elementary	1-5
Gail Anderson *	5 years	Karin Hansen	Elementary	1-5
Dana Nunn	1 year	Mary Franke	Elementary	1-5
Jayne Sutor	5 years	Anna Lopez	Elementary	6-10
Tom Thompson *	3 years	Paula Steinberg	Middle	1-5
Karl Mick	1 year	Marge McMann	Elementary	1-5
Karen Early *	5 years	Rande Simms	Elementary	1-5
Mindy Johnson *	3 years	Judy Thomas	Elementary & Middle	1-5
Leslie Ward *	2 years	Dorothy Smith	High School	1-5
Alex Lake *	6 years	Brenda Long	Middle & High School	1-5
Dan Reid *	6 years	Linda Baker	Elementary	1-5
Vivian Henry *	1 year	Cathy Peter	Elementary	1-5
Tamera Drake	8 years	Mary Keith	High School	6-10

* Participated in interviews

Appendix P

School Demographics

Participants	Region	Type of School	Approximate School Enrollment	Free & Reduced Lunch	LMC Schedule	F.T.E of the LMS
Administrators						
Jillian Loft	MW	Public/K-6	300	29%	Fixed	.4
Gail Anderson	NE	Public/K-5	500	4%	Fixed	1.0
Dana Nunn	NE	Public/K-6	100	50%	Fixed	.4
Jayne Sutor	SW	Public/K-5	500	78%	Fixed	1.0
Tom Thompson	MW	Public/6-8	500	30%	Fixed	.4
Karl Mick	NE	Public/K-5	400	3%	Combination	1.0
Karen Early	NE	Public/K-5	500	44%	Fixed	1.0
Mindy Johnson	MW	Parochial/PreK-8	150	4%	Flexible	.8
Leslie Ward	SE	Public/9-12	800	40%	Flexible	1.0
Alex Lake	NE	Public/7-12	400	50%	Combination	1.0
Dan Reid	NE	Public/PrK-4	500	42%	Fixed	1.0
Vivian Henry	W	Public/1-3	400	56.3%	Fixed	1.0
Tamera Drake	W	Public/9-12	2,000	17%	Fixed	1.0

Appendix Q

Reasons for Incompletes

Status	Reason	Number
Signed up initially but never completed the requirements for starting; never logged in	None given	4
Signed up and logged in but dropped out immediately	Personal or too busy (e.g., other work obligations; took a job in another district)	5
Signed up and logged in; started the course work but had to drop out	Personal or too busy (e.g., personal health, family member's health; took another job in another state)	9
Signed up and logged in; started but did not finish—did not reply to inquiries	Unknown	2
Signed up, logged in and completed in 2005 or 2006		20
Signed up for and completed the course in a later session		3
Total that completed		23

Appendix R

Interview Schedule 2006 and 2007

Spring-Summer 2006				
Administrator:	Karen Early	Tom Thompson	Gail Anderson	Jillian Loft
Interviews	Interview #1 May 18, 2006	Interview #1 May 18, 2006	Interview #1 June 28, 2006	Interview #1 June 28, 2006
	Interview #2 May 30, 2006	Interview #2 May 30, 2006	Interview #2 July 18, 2006	Interview #2 July 5, 2006
	Interview #3 June 7, 2006	Interview #3 June 8, 2006	Interview #3 July 26, 2006	Interview #3 July 12, 2006

Spring-Summer 2007					
Administrator:	Vivian Henry	Mindy Johnson	Alex Lake	Leslie Ward	Dan Reid
Interviews	Interview #1 June 5	Interview #1 June 6	Interview #1 June 8	Interview #1 June 11	Interview #1 June 12
	Interview #2 June 12	Interview #2 June 14	Interview #2 June 15	Interview #2 June 18	Interview #2 June 19
	Interview #3 June 19	Interview #3 June 20	Interview #3 June 28	Interview #3 July 9	Interview #3 June 26

Appendix S

Open Coding: Emerging Topics and Subtopics

<p>Role of the library media specialist</p> <p>Role of the administrator</p> <p>Role of the library media program</p> <p>Role of the classroom teacher</p> <p>Benefits for students</p> <p>Professional development</p> <p>Online course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Content Benefits Environment <p>Things learned</p> <p>Action Plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inservice for teachers—technology skills Professional development for the library media specialist Collaboration expectations Lay groundwork for the library media specialist New scheduling of the library media center New staffing of the library media center Focus points Guide for organization Curricular connections 	<p>Action Plans, cont.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery of curriculum standards Focus on information literacy Focus on research process Leadership opportunities for the Library media specialist Library media center connections to School Improvement Planning Job description for library media specialist Knowledge gained Grounds for communication Guide for budget decisions Impetus for program evaluation Evaluation of the library media specialist & the program Library media center staging of new technology Provided new way of seeing the library media program Library media center facilities improvement
--	--

Appendix T

Interpretive Impressions

1. Administrators as an enabler:

It seems the administrators are listing many characteristics that establish their role as an enabler for the library media specialist and the library media program.

Enabler—a person who gives support needed; provides access to resources, people; provides time and budget, facilitates access to staff, empowers others.

2. Administrators as an leader:

It seems an important role of the administrator is to be a leader in setting expectations for the library media program.

Leader—a person who communicates expectations; raises awareness; assists in guiding the program, provides reasons.

3. Administrators as communicators:

It seems a strong understanding is emerging about the importance of communication with the library media specialist, teachers, other administrators, school board, etc. regarding the library media program.

Communicator—a person who speaks about the library program and specialist; articulates expectations, explains how the library is part of and important to the educational program; tells staff and others.

4. Administrator as manager:

There seems to be recognition of the importance of the administrator in facilitating collaboration, use of the library, work with the library media specialist, goal setting, professional development, etc. through time, budget, scheduling, set expectations, evaluation, etc.

Manager—a person who sets the tone, arranges schedules, provides access, oversees the process, manages budget, facilitates.

5. Administrator as advocate:

It seems a theme for advocacy is emerging that indicates the role an administrator plays in raising awareness about the library media program, speaking up on behalf of the program, making it a priority and involving others.

Advocate—a person who becomes a voice for the library media program and a representative, speaks on behalf of the program.

6. Administrator as a learner:

There are many instances where the administrators are mentioning what they learned or are learning about library media programs, their role, the role of the library media specialist, the classroom teacher, etc. It seems they have a raised awareness about the potential of the library media programs.

Learner—is one who acquires new information, skills and awareness, new perspectives.

Appendix U

Changed Perceptions of Administrators

Themes from participants responses on course feedback forms:	Examples extracted from written comments on course surveys:
Changed expectations for the library media specialist and the program	<p>More understanding of training received; Responsibilities of the position; Collaboration with teachers; Better understanding of various roles; The need to use evaluation to match roles; Better prepared to understand the uniqueness of the position; Gained more specific information</p> <p>Higher expectations; View performance from different facets; More aware of what the library media specialist should know and do; More collaboration with teachers; Integration of lessons; Planning with teachers; Active role in teaching standards; Provide professional development for teachers; hub of the school;</p>
Improved ability to communicate with the library media specialist and others	<p>Ideas; Shared expectations; Richer conversation; Encourage more dialog; Need for regular communication; More focus to meetings with the library media specialist; valuable background information and facts; rationale</p>
Awareness of what the administrator can do to support the library media program	<p>Work on collaboration; Get teachers to use the library more; Conduct evaluation; Evaluation of the program and the library media specialist; Need to provide time; Provide inservice for teachers; Change the paradigm for self and teachers; Work with the library media specialist—encourage roles; Improve teachers perspectives;</p>

Appendix V

Themes from Administrators' Action Plans

Purchasing acquisitions for the library media center
Creating links to curriculum and information literacy
Creating links to teaching standards through research and information literacy
Enabling the library media specialist to be part of leadership teams
Providing time at staff meetings for library media communication
Providing time for teachers and the library media specialist to meet and plan
Redesigning the schedule for the library media program
Supporting the library media program (time, budget, staffing, scheduling)
Providing library media related in-service for teachers
Providing professional development for the library media specialist
Planning presentations for parents about the library media center
Identifying grant money to be used for library media resources
Focusing on improvement of communication with the library media specialist
Focusing on communication with teachers about the library media center
Focusing on integration of information literacy, the research process, and resources
Requiring teachers to report library media collaboration to the principal
Setting priorities for the library media program and acting on them
Developing long range goals for the library media program and finding funding
Beginning the process of curriculum mapping with library resources
Creating a job description for the library media specialist
Evaluating the library media program
Refocusing the evaluation of the library media specialist; make it relevant
Improving the use of technology—showcase new technology through library media
Linking library media program goals to School Improvement Planning

Appendix W

Level of Preparation and Importance of Information

Module 4 Course Feedback Questions rated on 5-point scale:				
Extremely Important Important Somewhat Important Not Really Important Not Important				
Do you think information about how to develop and evaluate a school library program should be included in the course work to earn a Principal's Certificate?	YES	NO	No Answer	100% of those who responded answered yes, information about school libraries should be included in course work for principals.
	11	0	2	
Overall, how important is the information that you learned in the "Partners for Success" online program for administrators?	Rating Scale:			
	Extremely Important Somewhat Important		Important Not Really Important Not Important	
	Extremely Important	Important	Somewhat Important	No Answer
	6	5	1	1
Of the 12 participants that responded to the question, 50% felt the information learned was "Extremely Important," 42% felt it was "Important" and 8 % felt it was "Somewhat Important."				
General Course Survey Question:				
In your course work for your principal certificate, did you have content that addressed how to develop and evaluate a school library media program?	YES	NO	100% of the participants had not had information related to developing and evaluating school library programs in their administrative course work.	
	0	12		

Appendix X

Learning Levels in an Online Environment

Response options:	Rating:
Better than a face-to-face graduate class:	1
Same as a face-to-face class:	5
Less than a face-to-face class:	6
No rating:	1

Overall, how important is the information that you learned in the “partners for success” online program for administrators?

Extremely important	6
Important	5
Somewhat Important	1
Not Really Important	0
Not Important	0
No Response	1

Appendix Y

Online Survey Questions Rated Highest by Administrators

Survey Item:	Administrators 2006 & 2007 Post-survey	Library Media Specialists 2006 & 2007
1. Rate the following in terms of importance as they relate to the responsibilities of the library media specialist:		
a. Developing and maintaining a library media collection aligned to the curriculum.	Mean 4.0	Mean 4.0
b. Working collaboratively with teachers to meet learning objectives.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.9
n. Exhibiting strong people skills.	Mean 3.9	Mean 3.8
2. How important are the following for a strong library media program?		
e. Support and encouragement of the building principal.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.9
i. Sufficient technology is available to access information	Mean 3.9	Mean 3.8
k. A full time certified/endorsed library media specialist.	Mean 3.9	Mean 3.9
n. Library media program goals that align with school improvement planning.	Mean 3.9	Mean 3.6
q. Presence of a wide range of up-to-date, curriculum related resources.	Mean 3.9	Mean 3.7
u. The library has an up-to-date automated catalog and circulation system.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.8
3. How would you rate the following in terms of your responsibilities as an administrator in relationship to the library media program in your building?		
b. Conducting appraisal /evaluation/observation of the certified/endorsed library media specialist.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.5
7. Rate the importance of using the following tools/strategies when evaluating the library media program:		
c. Informal visits.	Mean 3.9	Mean 3.4
i. Formal visits.	Mean 3.9	Mean 3.1

Appendix Z

Online Survey Questions Rated Highest by Library Media Specialists

Survey Item:	Library Media Specialists 2006 & 2007	Administrators 2006 & 2007
1. Rate the following in terms of importance as they relate to the responsibilities of the library media specialist:		
a. Developing and maintaining a library media collection aligned to the curriculum.	Mean 4.0	Mean 4.0
d. Ensuring students' understanding of the ethical use of information.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.8
e. Ensuring students' ability to evaluate resources for reliability, accuracy, and currency.	Mean 3.9	Mean 3.8
f. Assisting students with the research process	Mean 3.9	Mean 3.6
g. Teaching information /library skills (the ability to locate, use and communicate information.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.8
h. Promoting student appreciation of literature.	Mean 3.9	Mean 3.5
5. Rate the importance of each item listed below in regard to what the library media specialist should communicate with you as the administrator:		
j. Special promotions (reading, book fairs, etc.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.4

VITA

Deborah D. Levitov was born in Lexington, Nebraska. She is currently managing editor of *School Library Media Activities Monthly* and *Crinkles* magazines owned by Libraries Unlimited-ABC-CLIO. Before taking the position with Libraries Unlimited she worked for Lincoln Public Schools in Lincoln, Nebraska for 25 years. She was a school library media specialist and, later, coordinator of Library Media Services for the district. She received her undergraduate degree in Social Work from the University of Nebraska and later completed hours for an elementary education teaching certificate. She then completed an M. Ed. in Educational Administration with a supervisory certificate and a library media endorsement for K-12. She completed her Ph.D. in 2009.